AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Bricket Wood,
St. Albans, Herts.

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

REFERENCE
Please do not take from this room
Ambassador College
NOV 13 1979

AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY JOURNAL
dealing with Race and Inheritance in the Fields of
ETHNOLOGY ETHNO- AND HUMAN GENETICS
ETHNO-PSYCHOLOGY · RACIAL HISTORY
DEMOGRAPHY AND ANTHROPO-GEOGRAPHY

Vol. XII, No. 2 · October-December 1971
40p · $1.50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IAAEE REPRINTS

FINDINGS ON RACIAL DIFFERENCES BY MODERN SCIENTISTS

These Reprints provide scholars, students and others with easy access to important articles on the race question by leading scientists, originally published in specialized professional journals. Currently available are thirteen titles. Others are in preparation. All are priced at 25 cents a copy, except Nos. 11 and 12 which are 50 cents.

1. KLINEBERG'S CHAPTER ON RACE AND PSYCHOLOGY by Henry E. Garrett.
2. ZOOLOGICAL SUBSPECIES OF MAN by E. Raymond Hall.
3. ON THE NATURE OF PREJUDICE by A. James Gregor
4. ETHNIC GROUP DIFFERENCES by Stanley D. Porteus.
5. THE CONTROL OF EVOLUTION IN MAN by C. D. Darlington.
6. THE EMERGENCE OF RACIAL GENETICS by R. Ruggles Gates.
7. THE RACIAL HISTORY OF SCANDINAVIA by Bertil J. Lundman.
8. SOME NEGLECTED ASPECTS OF THE 'MINORITIES' PROBLEM by George A. Lundberg.
9. THE S.P.S.S.I. AND RACIAL DIFFERENCES by Henry E. Garrett.
10. SOCIAL SCIENCE TESTIMONY IN THE DESEGREGATION CASES: A REPLY TO PROFESSOR KENNETH CLARK by Ernest van den Haag.
11. THE INHERITANCE OF MENTAL ABILITY by Sir Cyril Burt.
12. THE AMERICAN MELTING POT: ITS MEANING TO US by John M. Radzinski.
13. PSYCHODIAGNOSIS, PROGNOSIS, SCHOOL DESEGREGATION AND DELINQUENCY by Clairette P. Armstrong.

Order from:

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ETHNOLOGY AND EUGENICS, INC.
P.O. Box 3495, Grand Central Station
New York, N.Y. 10017

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Race and Modern Science

Edited, with an introduction, by
Robert E. Kuttner

The sixteen monographs in this four-part volume—anthropology, biology, sociology and psychology—by natural and social scientists, many of whom are internationally known and recognized as authorities in their fields, explore the differences between the races of man. These essays are especially timely as a contribution to the body of modern scientific literature in view of the fact that for a number of years there has been a sustained effort to explain away racial differences as nothing more than the color of the skin. The scientists brought together in this volume present evidence that the races of man differ not only in physical appearance but also psychologically and in various respects biologically.

484 pages *$7.95*

The Testing of Negro Intelligence

By Audrey M. Shuey

This new edition of Dr Shuey's important work, first published in 1958, is a thorough revision and updating of the earlier book. The work has been expanded with much new material added. In this new edition Dr Shuey summarizes 382 studies of mental tests given to Negroes and Whites in the United States during the last fifty years. Also included are results of tests of some 1600 Negroes in Ontario and the West Indian islands of Jamaica and Grand Cayman. Upon publication of the first edition Dr Corrado Gini, late president of the International Institute of Sociology, wrote: "... the volume constitutes a milestone in this area. After its publication, the burden of proof rests upon those who reject its conclusions."

578 pages *$6.50*

SOCIAL SCIENCE PRESS

310 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rivista di Etnografia

A yearly journal of

ETHNOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY, FOLKLORE,
CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY,
HISTORY OF RELIGIONS,
SOCIOLOGY, ETHNO-PSYCHOLOGY

Published under the auspices of
the National Research Council
Editor: Dr Giovanni Tucci

Subscription: 5000 lire (or equivalent) yearly

Rivista di Etnografia
via Belsito a Posillipo 17
Naples, Italy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XII, NO. 2 THE OCTOBER-DECEMBER 1971

MANKIND

QUARTERLY

— mala opinio bene parta delectet —

EDITOR
R. GAYRE OF GAYRE, M.A., D.Phil., Pol.D.Sc., D.Sc.

HONORARY ASSOCIATE EDITORS
Professor HENRY E. GARRETT, Ph.D., D.Sc.
Professor MARIO CAPPIERI
Professor FRANK C. J. MCGURK

FORMER HONORARY ASSOCIATE EDITORS
† Professor R. RUGGLES GATES, M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.
† Professor CORRADO GINI, LL.D., D.Soc., D.Sc., D.Econ., D.Soc.Sc.

ASSISTANT EDITORS
ROBERT KUTTNER, B.S., Ph.D.
ROBERT H. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.R.S.(Edin.), F.G.S.

HONORARY ADVISORY BOARD

Professor Santiago Alcobé, Barcelona, Spain; Professor P. C. Biswas Delhi, India; Sir Raphael Cilento, Brisbane, Australia; Professor Alberto Xavier da Cunha, Coimbra, Portugal; Professor Gerrit Daams, Kent, Ohio, U.S.A.; Professor A. P. Elkin, Sydney, Australia; Professor Luigi Gedda, Rome, Italy; Professor Dr E. Hanhart, Zurich, Switzerland; Professor J. D. J. Hofmeyr, Pretoria, South Africa; Professor Charles C. Josey, Indianapolis, Indiana, U.S.A.; Dr Watson Kirkconnell, Wolfville, Canada; Dr Taku Komai, Kyoto, Japan; Professor Bertil Lundman, Uppsala, Sweden; Professor Frank C. J. McGurk, Villanova, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.; Professor Branimiro Males, Tucuman, Argentina; Dr Clarence P. Oliver, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.; Professor S. D. Porteus, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.; Professor Stefan T. Possony, Stanford, California, U.S.A.; Dr David C. Rife, Gainesville, Florida, U.S.A.; Professor Alfredo Sacchetti, Naples, Italy; Professor M. R. Sahni, Panjab, India; Professor Herbert Sanborn, Tenessee, U.S.A.; Professor Walter Scheidt, Hamburg, West Germany; Dr John Scudder, New York, U.S.A.; Professor Sergio Sergi, Rome, Italy; Dr Audrey M. Shuey, Lynchburg, Virginia, U.S.A.; Professor M. J. Sirks, Groningen, Netherlands; Professor Torsten Sjögren, Stockholm, Sweden; Professor Giovanni Tucci, Naples, Italy; Professor Harry Turney, High, Columbia, South Carolina, U.S.A.; Professor O. v. Verschuer, Münster, Westphalia, West Germany; Professor H. V. Vallois, Paris, France; Dr R. J. Walsh, Sydney, Australia; Professor K. Robert V. Wikman, Abo, Finland.

Published by
THE MANKIND QUARTERLY
1 Darnaway Street, Edinburgh, EH3 6DW, Scotland

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 2 OCTOBER-DECEMBER 1971

CONTENTS

A RATIONALISATION OF THE ETHNOLOGICAL DIVISIONS OF MANKIND
by R. Gayre of Gayre 65

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ETHNOLOGY
by Donald A. Swan 78

THE SOCIAL STRATIFICATION OF MAYAN CIVILISATION DURING THE CLASSIC PERIOD (A.D. 600-900)
by Azzo Ghidinelli 99

RACE, THE "NATION OF EUROPE" AND IDEOLOGY: A CRITIQUE
by Hermann Kiesel 111

BOOK REVIEWS 116

© 1971 The Mankind Quarterly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Rationalisation of the Ethnological Divisions of Mankind

By R. GAYRE OF GAYRE

It is not possible in the following paper to deal *in extenso* with the details of human evolution. All we are concerned with is to indicate in what measure, and in what divisions, we believe it occurred. As such, this is a statement solely of a theory of evolution of the main human stocks. Proof must be sought elsewhere to justify the propositions adjuced.

Attempts have often been made to classify the hominoid stocks of mankind. These have usually, if not always, been based on concepts of divergent evolution from a common stem. While this is a postulate which is admissable, as one possible theory, it is not the only one, and, in my opinion, is the one which presents several insuperable difficulties. The alternative is the one which considers the major stocks as well established at a very much earlier horizon in geological time, and, consequently, whether before that development was by way of parallel evolution or not, it certainly was once we reach the stage of Neanderthal man and his immediate ancestors.

Having, therefore, arrived at a conclusion to interpret the divisions of man on a theory of parallel evolution, one is not tied to the theory that all men arose on one line of ascent from the *Australopithicene* stage *in Africa*. On the contrary we are forced to consider several, or even many, centres for the ultimate development of the stocks of men, extinct and living. In accordance with such a view it is feasible to conclude that in various centres parallel development occurred, so that men of different lines of ascent passed through similar stages of ascent.

The absence of apes in Inner Asia, at the present time, and the lack of the discovery, for the moment, of early primitive forms of man there, does not invalidate this view. For there have been advocates that great apes formerly existed in Inner Asia: and one cannot treat, with certainty, that Africa was the sole country where early types of creatures on the line of ascent of man existed. The very early remains from Java and Pekin presuppose that very primitive types must have existed in Eastern Asia. The fact is that more systematic discoveries have taken place in Africa than in those other places where it would be expected the most primitive early ancestors of man would have existed. Much of Siberia, Turkestan, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Kansu and Sinkiang are *terra incognita*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Therefore, in brief, we envisage several centres giving rise, sometimes, to clusters of stocks of analogous types.

In the east we believe that there was a *Homo mongolicus* developing by progressive stages from earlier primitive forms, up through such as *Sinanthropus pekinensis*, until the end-product of the development is the Mongoloid stock, and its offshoot, the Amerindian.

We have observed elsewhere[1] that if we were honestly to use the terminology of zoology then, on taxonomic grounds, we must call such a major stock a species. As it is, men use the term species logically till they arrive at mankind, when they inconsistently call what, on a zoological basis, would be called species, a *race*. To add to the confusion, they then make the subdivision of these so-called "races", *races*! The outcome is that only confusion is created. Since there is ample evidence that inter-breedability is no test of species, the fact that the major races can be crossed and produce fertile offspring is quite irrelevant. Consequently, we prefer, in this paper, for the purpose of greater precision of thought, to use the term *species* for the major stocks of mankind, and to use sub-species where such a stock is in certain big agglomerations, and, finally within these smaller divisions, we have races.

This terminology will be resisted because of ideological concepts, religious and political, which are determined that mankind must be considered one species. But, without reading too much into this term, we are certain it can be justified in the sense in which we are using it, and that it enables us to classify and interpret mankind's ramifications with much greater ease.

The characteristic of the Mongoloid species is seen in the yellow or sallow skin, the broad skull, wide face, short legs, powerful leg muscles, and the slanting "screwed up" eyes, with the Mongolic fold. The form of the eyes indicates natural selection, during evolution, by an adaptation for life in a wind-swept and cold terrain of high mountains and plateaus, where protection of the eyes in blizzards in winter, and strong sunlight in summer, are needed. This leads us to conclude that the evolution of the Mongoloid races was in the Pamirs, Tibet, and adjacent mountainous regions of Inner Asia. However, in America there developed another branch of the Mongoloid stock. At one time the Amerindian stock was thought to be a recent branch of the Mongoloid. It was believed that the Amerindian entered America at the end of the Ice Age, about 12,000 years ago. The latest evidence, supported by modern techniques of dating, has shown finds over 40,000 years old. It is conceivable, therefore, that this "branch" of the Mongoloid stock separated very early, and

[1] In my lectures to the Genetics Congress of Southern Africa in 1962.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before any of the linguistic developments which now characterise Asiatic peoples, and, before the types of civilization they have evolved, had any substantial beginnings. The evolution of the Mongolo-Amerindians, both racially and culturally, has been a parallel development with the Mongoloid. Occasionally, in the cultural sphere, there may have been borrowings from other civilizations, but what is significant is the basically indigenous character of Amerindian cultures taken as a whole.

The fact that the Mongolo-Amerindians have the O group, whereas (as I have mentioned elsewhere) the outer ring of Mongoloids in Asia tend to have O and the inner B, supports the view that these two stocks have been separate for a long time.

There is also another phenomenon associated with the development and distribution of *Homo mongolicus* which is of importance in emphasising that we are not dealing with various stocks of man of recent differentiation, but of groups (which I prefer to call species) which have long been separated and have evolved on distinct lines of ascent in parallel.

This phenomenon is the survival of early hominoid types till relatively recent times in various parts of the world, and, in modern times in particular in the continued survival of a very primitive " man-like " creature in Inner Asia. This stock was known to Linnaeus, and he made provision for it in his classification of *Homo nocturnus* and, or, *Homo troglodytes*, meaning respectively Night or Cave Man. This stock V. A. Khakhlov, a Russian zoologist, called *Primihomo asiaticus* (Primaeval Asiatic Man).[2]

This species has a well-established history throughout history in South-west China, South-east Russia, and, bordering on the Pamirs, it has many local names. It has been seen often by local people and hunters, by expeditions, and military detachments, actually killed and measured by medical men, so that, despite what almost looks like a conspiracy of silence, there is no doubt of its existence. Dr B. Porshnev, a pioneer in the study of this hominoid species, likens it to Neanderthal man, but in my view that is untenable, as the features show a broad skull with high cheek-bones. It is hirsute to a high degree, and there appear to be several varieties, perhaps races, within the species. Its appearance would indicate, apart from its location which is centred upon Inner Asia, that it is of a pre-proto-Mongoloid type, as might well be expected. The dark skin and the broad nostrils have caused the Georgian varieties to be called *Zaugri* (dark or even Negroid) in appearance. But in all else it would seem to be nearer the Mongoloid than any other human species. Some of these people (known by many names, but mainly *Almas*,

[2] Odette Tchernine, *The Yeti*, Neville Speerman, London, 1970.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the Russian peoples) have been partly domesticated, and in certain cases it is claimed they have on crossing with modern man given rise to fertile offspring[3]. Tibetan tradition also speaks of fertile crossings with this stock, since they claim a descent from the Monkey King and the female rock dweller[4].

It would seem, therefore, there is still surviving an ancient species, of a parallel but arrested line of ascent to the Mongoloid, sharing many of its peculiarities, which, if it came off that line, must have separated from it at a very early stage before the Mongoloid languages of every kind, or even speech, had begun to be evolved. It would seem to represent a stage of development which might have been that of the Mongoloids a quarter of a million years ago. Whether, even then, that it came immediately off the same family tree, at that time, is not certain. It may have been derived from it at an immeasurably earlier period of time, or even not at all, as it may be a case of complete parallel evolution.

The existence of this species helps us to realise that the differences between stocks are specific, and, furthermore, it would emphasise, as has been well known for some time, if the fertility of cross-breeding with it is accepted, that the fertility of crossings between major groups is no evidence that they belong to the same species.

Another feature of any study of the evidence for the survival of *Primihomo asiaticus* is that the accounts we have of crossings between this species, the Mongoloids, and quasi-Causasoids, not only produce fertile offspring, but quite normal human beings. The only trait which shows any difference is that they have a tendency to a high pointed skull, and broad flat noses and features. Since these traits are found among the Tibetans they may be due to the crossing with some of this strain. If that is so, then we have to postulate hybrids between the major stocks, where natural selection will have favoured selection to that end. Consequently, as we have shown elsewhere, where the Cushitic peoples are concerned, racial-breeds between the various human populations in certain regions can be created, even if they are not so distant as in the case of the alleged crossings between *Homo mongolicus* and *Primihomo asiaticus*.

Incidentally, *Primihomo asiaticus* may be a distant relation of the *Yeti*, accounts of which we hear frequently from the Indian side of the high Central Asiatic mountain complex. Tenzing, the well-known Sherpa mountaineer, tells us[5] that the head of the

[3] Odette Tchernine, *op. cit.*, pp. 155 ff.

[4] Odette Tchernine, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

[5] Sherpa Tenzing, *Man of Everest: The Autobiography of Tenzing*, London, 1955, pp. 90 ff.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yeti is pointed at the top. He also says it is nocturnal in its habits. It has broad cheek bones[6]. He has formed the opinion that it is a big mountain ape — in a region where no apes are found!

If *Primihomo asiaticus* is some form of proto- or sub-*Homo sapiens* it could be classified on one side of the human barrier or the other. Be all that as it may, we have merely brought in the account of the *Almas, Yeti,* or *Primihomo asiaticus* to drive home the view that there are, and always have been, many types of " man ", and that each of these different types amounts to a species, each one which, we also believe, is inter-breedable with another. If this is so then the major human stocks can be regarded in the same light. Furthermore, we are led to the conclusion that with the inter-action of genetic segregation and natural selection, hybrids between these primary groups (stocks, " races " or species) can be created.

Relevant to this is also the position of the Cappoids and the Andamanese. The usual interpretation of the former is that they are a separate stock which has arisen in Southern Africa. This view I do not accept, as there are traces of the Cappoid type in countries of West Africa, and in the Horn of Africa there are unmistakable Bushman types to be found. The fact that the Hottentots are related both to the Bushmen and also to the Cushitic stock, that they derived their pastoralism from the latter, and have elements in their speech which show contact with Hamitic speaking peoples, all argues powerfully for a northern origin for the Cappoids as a whole. The traditions and myths of the Bushmen all look to the north as their place of origin. The northern Africa rock art has relationships with that of the Bushmen, although I agree with those who deny it has a connection with the Franco-Cantabrian, as there is not the slightest evidence that Cappoids found their way into Europe. The denial of such a penetration does not establish the contrary, that the Cappoids belonged to Southern Africa *ab initio*. Boskopoid types in early Southern African archaeology does not establish that they were directly ancestral to the Bushmen. They could quite well be parallel lines of evolution, or remote southern branches of the same stock which was ultimately to develop into the Cappoids.

The Bushmen have steatopygy and broad faces as characteristic of their type. Normally such faces have a broad skull, which is absent in this case. Their skin is tawny or yellow. In general appearance they are, therefore, some sort of proto- or quasi-Mongoloid, and had they the broad skull it would be impossible to deny this connection. The lack of broad skull could be explained either by mutations or by genetic crossing over in cross-breeding with a long skulled stock, out of which the mainly Mongoloid

[6] Sherpa Tenzing, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traits have survived. Steatopygy and pepper-corn hair in the Negroid Bantu is not evidence of a derivation of the Cappoids from the Negroids. It is simply evidence of the tremendous absorption of Cappoid genes by Negroid peoples. The clicks (which decrease as one goes northwards) in the Bantu languages is another evidence of this. The occurence of steatopygy, combined with broad faces, and yellow brown skins, in the women of the Sotho and other peoples in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal, are all evidence of this enormous absorption of Cappoid genes by the Bantu. Consequently, the occurrence of pepper-corn hair in the same people is to be looked upon as a Cappoid trait, and not one which is shared equally by Cappoids and Negroids. The true Negroid hair is of a woolly formation.

Therefore, it is clear that in the Cappoids we have a distinct stock, unrelated to the Negroid, with one part of it, the Hottentot, crossed with the Cushitic of the Horn of Africa.

When we find in the Andamanese Islanders, the broad face, and broad skull which we would associate with the Mongoloids, and at the same time steatopygy in the women — which is not a common feature among human races — it looks very much as though we have in these people another stock which is, either derived from a common origin with the Cappoids, or is a parallel development, also on a proto-Mongoloid basis.

We have, so it will be seen, in a very scarcely populated world, at an early period of the speciation of *Homo sapiens*, a dispersal of proto-Mongoloid stocks (or stocks homologous to them) which comprehend Cappoids from North Africa penetrating southwards to the Cape; proto-Andamanese extending to the Bay of Bengal; and then northwards into the heartlands of Inner Asia, the Mongoloids. Of an earlier phase of development, before the *Homo sapiens* period, there were Boskopoids in Southern Africa, which we would associate with the same direction of development, being either a related, or a homologous, species arising by parallel development.

Among the Negroid stocks we also have evidence of a very wide distribution. It is generally accepted that their region of characterisation is the hot equatorial lands of the Niger and the Congo, which, in earlier times, had much more rain-forest than is the case today. An offshoot of these peoples are the pygmies of the deep forests of equatorial Central Africa. Then in the east, we find other evidences of Negroid types. In India there are traces of Negroid types in such as the Marias of Bastar, in Central India. When we go further east we find in Melanesia a distinctly Negroid stock, which should not be confused with the Australoid elements also to be found in the same region.

Since there is the inter-connecting link in Central India we

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be dealing with two distinct branches of the Negroid stock. If we think of the Negroid as a species, then each of these would be sub-species, out of which various races of Negroes have arisen in Africa, and in Melanesia. However, classification of the Negroid peoples has never advanced so far as it has in Caucasoid ethnology, where we have very clearly defined races, such as Nordic, Mediterranean, Alpine, and so on.

One reason for this is that it may not, in fact, be possible, since definite races, as distinctive types with their own geographical regionalism, may not be fully developed. It is my opinion that Negro development into distinctive sub-divisions, analagous to the Caucasoid races, has been inhibited by the fact that the Negroids have been overwhelmed time and again by conquerors not only from within their own stock but also by people from others, and particularly from the Caucasoids. This has prevented distinct racial regionalisation from developing in a clearly perceptible way.

The differences we perceive are rather due to cross-breeding with other strains, than a natural, " family-tree " type of evolution within their own stock. Thus in the Nilotics we perceive Cushitic elements, and in the Western Sudanese Caucasoid. It is these alien elements which produce the differences which are to be observed within the Negroids rather than the evolution into different races.

Returning to the two major sections of this Black stock, which we believe cannot be regarded as races, but must be held to be sub-species by my classification, we have the African and the Melanesian Negroids. That is, if we assume they are branches of a common stock and are not the result of parallel development.

Yet, on the other hand, it is always possible that the eastern and western Negroids are separate evolutions by parallel development. This view is likely to be rejected by most anthropologists, although the grounds for doing so, in the absence of evidence of how we come to find these two big groups of Negroids, one in Africa, and the other in the Far East, is not very decisive.

Mr Leakey, on one occasion, when I visited his excavations in Kenya, reminded me that Professor A. C. Haddon not only believed that the two stocks were of one origin, but that, in Haddon's opinion, the probability was that the African Negroids were derived from the oriental. Certainly, with so many sites for early species of men, right back to Java Man, located in the East, it could well be that the occidental Negroids are later in time.

The Australoids present us with a conception of sweeping in a long line, from Palestine, probably through Arabia, and along the shores of the Red Sea, into North-east Africa, thence onward

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through India (where their type is seen in the Murias of Bastar), to Ceylon (the Veddahs), and thence through Melanesia, into Australia. Their type has something in common with the Neanderthal, and they may be originally related. The Ainu, in my opinion, are a section of the Australoid which I have called the Ainoid, and which is a fairer-skinned branch, arising very early in the development of the stock, which spread along the Pacific coast of Asia. Ultimately it passed over into America to give rise to the so-called Australoid elements to be found among some of the Amerindians. Since, in many aspects of the characters of the Australoid and the Ainoids, there are features which are similar to those in a primitive Caucasoid, it may well be that these, with the Neanderthaloid, arise from the same general stem from which the Caucasoids originally have been derived. In the Ainoid there may also be a later Caucasoid infusion. However, parallel evolution should not be overlooked, and we must have much more evidence before we can postulate any theory with certainty. It is, nevertheless, a useful working hypothesis to accept a remote relationship of Caucasoid, Neanderthaloid, Australoid, and Ainoid. In my view the classification would be that of the Caucasoid and proto-Australoid as species, with the Australoid and Ainoid as sub-species within the proto-Australoid. The Neanderthaloid might well have been a separate species lying between the proto-Caucasoid and the proto-Australoid, although all at a more remote period, if they did not arise by parallel lines of evolution, were from a common stock.

The Caucasoids themselves do not present any great problem. They appear to have developed in Eurasia, and in particular from the Siberian Plain westwards into Europe, where they were already in an advanced stage of evolution, both physically, mentally, and spiritually, in the Upper Palaeolithic, and, particularly, in the Aurignacian and Magdalenian periods. They remained throughout their evolution within this great land-mass area, until they were numerous enough to expand into North Africa, India, and beyond, and overseas in historical times. Again, using my taxonomic terminology, they form a compact and clearly defined specific group, which divides into the well-known racial types of classical European anthropology.

The Amerindians are basically a very early branch of the Mongoloid stock, in the views of most anthropologists. The evidence, as I have already observed, is now accumulating to show that early man arrived in America much earlier than was formerly thought to be the case: 40,000 years ago is now being asserted. The situation is complicated in that the Amerindians have absorbed Ainoid or proto-Australoid of some type or another (which in my view accounts for certain blood-group

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peculiarities among some of them), and also some Caucasoid. Some of this was perhaps from as early a time as Chancelade man. The rest came in during later times right down to the early historic. Apart from this there has been a certain amount of miscegenation which has occurred after the conquest of America by the Europeans.

In my view, the survival of a *Primihomo asiaticus* to our own times, if this is sustained, as I think it must be from the evidence and accounts which are becoming available, the considerations raised by the Cappoids, by the classifications we have attempted, and especially by those involving the Negroids and Australoids, all indicate that we are dealing with a group of species. The terminology of *race* is too inexact, and does not allow for the vast differences which occur taxonomically in mankind. Till now we have been obsessed by the fact that all stocks of mankind can inter-breed, and this has been taken as evidence of close relationship. That there never were any grounds for misusing the fact of fertility in crosses, between various species in this way, was well known. However, because of ideological reasons, which have been allowed to impinge powerfully upon anthropological classification, the inter-breedability argument was allowed to be used as though it proved a *monogenic* theory of Man's origins. Bearing in mind Professor Coon's view, that the present stocks had already separated in the *Homo erectus* stage, a view with which I concur entirely, and that there has been a considerable difference in time between the passage of one and the other into the *Homo sapiens* stage of development, it seems to me that the only terminology which we should use for the major stocks is that of species. In that case, such a stock as the Bushman, if indeed it is related to the Mongoloid through being derived from a common proto-Mongoloid stage, is a sub-species of the Mongoloid. If it is not related, then it is of a parallel origin. In that event the apparently common features are merely homologous. If so, we are then presented with two separate species.

Within those species, and their sub-species which constitute long stable breeding lines, in specifically well-marked geographical areas where they can characterise themselves, we get races of a clearly definable type. This is particularly true among the Caucasoids, and to only a lesser degree of the Mongoloids. This tends to occur more markedly where, in my view, the major stock (or species) has long occupied its zone of habitation — as has been so in the case of the Caucasoids and the Mongoloids.

In addition, however, there are broad belts between species and sub-species, where crossing has occurred, followed by natural selection, aided by mutations, and crossing-over genetically, which have produced what I have called racial-breeds. The Cushitic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or Ethiopic type is a particularly clear example of this. In this case we have a breed which is based upon a Caucasoid-Australoid cross. This practically amounts to a sub-species in itself, but as it has arisen from crossing I prefer to call it a *breed*. Because colour is so emotive, especially nowadays, this Cushitic stock is thought of as Black, and, therefore, by an extension of that classification as Negroid. In fact it has no fundamental relationship to the Negroid at all. The black skin of the upper class Abyssinian, of the Somali, and of much of the Nubian stock, shows no great element of Negroid traits. The face, type of hair, and the structure of the body is not Negroid. These peoples are under no illusions about this, and readily recognise the difference between themselves and the Negroes. In the case of the Abyssinians, as I have pointed out elsewhere, in the Amhara, the language of Ethiopia, the word for *slave* and for *Negro* is synonymous. Although, today, Ethiopia may be the champion of *Black* Africa, and that means in the terminology of our times, *Negro* Africa, such Negroid genes as are found in the Ethiopian peoples, are derived from their frequent enslavement until recent times of Negro populations. It is important that we should not allow an objective assessment of racial relationships to be influenced by the subjective social, and political, thinking of our times. These are making investigations into Man's inter-relationships almost impossible, generating every form of bitter emotional attack, which is rarely concerned with the facts and is solely for the purpose of defending an ideology.

In addition to clearly marked racial-breeds, such as the Cushitic, we also have other old crosses, which now, by the same genetic processes as those which created such racial-breeds, have produced distinct types out of those breeds. Thus, the Nilotic in Africa is, in my view, a cross between the Cushitic racial-breed and the Negroid. To these Nilotics belong such peoples as the Masai and the Watutsis. We have in such people a breed which carries certain traits of the Negroids, but in which there also survive other characters derived from the Cushitic racial-breed. In such instances we should classify the people concerned as a sub-racial-breed. Like the Cushitic from which they are in this way partially derived, the Nilotic is an established type, which is genetically stable. Where there are individuals whose traits would suggest that this is not so, it is due to later back-crossings into one or the other of the parental stocks. On the borders of Russia and China, in the region of the Gobi Desert we have similar conditions between the Yellow and White stocks.

The facts of ethnological distribution, history, and classification fit more economically into a conception of early speciation, followed by sub-speciation, race-formation, and racial-breed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formations, for the various stocks of mankind, than into one which conceives of a late differentiation into what are popularly called "races." This latter day monogenism is neither logical in its classifications, nor does it account for the facts at our disposal when we attempt to draw up a logical ethnological relationship of the various types of mankind. It may suit sociological theories and ideological concepts, but it does not assist an objective classification of mankind. It was ideological pressures, combined with insufficient information about early man, and his various types, which led to the overthrow of the once all-dominant *polygenist* school of thought, which was so important in the United States of America in the nineteenth century. A *polygenist* interpretation will prove, I am firmly convinced, a more rational one than the prevailing *monogenist*. concept. This does not mean that at some remote period, in the *Homo erectus* or pre-*Homo erectus* stage of evolution of mankind, there may not have been a common genetic inheritance. That we are in no position to be positive about, one way or another, at the present state of our knowledge. It does not mean that we have not to consider all stocks of mankind (whether we regard them as divided into species, sub-species, and racial-breeds, as well as races, or not) as truly equally human. Ethics and social attitudes, should not be dragged into this subject at all. They are something quite apart, but I fear that most people take their stand on their ideological position and then argue from that — usually to the *monogenist* solution, inadequate as it is to explain satisfactorily the facts. Now that the Vatican has declared that if there are sapient human beings on other planets they are as much in need of Salvation through Christ as the inhabitants of this earth, is it really essential any longer to take a stand upon *monogenism* to fit, at least, the Christian ideology? Yet the driving force in the nineteenth century against a *polygenist* interpretation of mankind's varying stocks came from the passionately held belief that all men must be descended from Adam. This view was, even in itself, based upon entirely wrong premises. Here, I feel I may be excused in departing briefly into Biblical exegesis, since it has been the cause of creating, in the first place, the *monogenist* position, which has since been taken up by other, and opposing, ideologies. The Adamic story talks of other people (when Cain feared that others would kill him, if he were found by them, when he was driven from the Garden of Eden). There are, in fact, two stories in *Genesis*. The first chapter is concerned with a general creation of life, including mankind (" Let us make man," *Genesis* I, v. 26), and a restricted, or particular, story of the creation of Adam *Genesis* II, v. 7). Above all, when the descendants of Noah,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after the Flood, are recounted in *Genesis* VI, all the nations given in great detail are descended from Ham, Shem, and Japhet. I did an intensive research on this ethnography when I was a post-graduate student of anthropology at Oxford, under the late Dr R. R. Marett. There is not a single nation mentioned in that long list which is of any other stock than one of those of the Caucasoid groups of peoples. Therefore, it is clear that the Adamic story is a localised one (as all archaeological evidence makes clear) and it is imbedded in the happenings of the peoples of Caucasoid origin in the Near East, and the Mediterranean lands.

Therefore, the Biblical ideology (as it was then conceived) which was so instrumental in sweeping the *polygenist* conception out of the way in the nineteenth century, was based on false interpretations of Biblical evidence, in so far as it may be considered relevant to an understanding of man's origin. This illustrates how dangerous it is to permit ideological, ostensibly ethical and sociological, theories to influence logical interpretations of the ethnological relationships of mankind. Whether we are of *monogenic* or *polygenic* origins is irrelevant when we come to consider man as a social entity, as a spiritual and intelligent human being. But equally irrelevant are ethical and sociological theories to the interpretation of the origins of mankind.

It is such highly emotional, subjective, concepts, which are generated by equalitarian philosophers, politicians, and sociological theorists, which today stand completely in the way of ascertaining the truth in connection with mankind.

The attacks which we see being made on Dr Shockley, on Professor Jensen, which have been aimed at Professors Garrett, George, and the late Ruggles Gates, and myself, are all part of this attempt to stifle scientific inquiry in favour of conformity to pre-conceived, and let me say it, largely unsubstantiated, subjective theorising.

The views of relationship, or lack of it, of the various stocks of mankind, which I have expressed in this paper, may, in part, be wrong. (They cannot be wholly wrong in all aspects, for if they are then all scientific investigation concerning man is disproved, and that simply cannot be true). Nevertheless, whether right or wrong, the views are those which do express readily a rational classification of mankind, and, until disproved by scientific investigation, they have as much right to be presented as any others.

After a life-time of study, and work, in the field of racial research, interpretation, and classification, I have come firmly to the conviction that it is on the basis of some degree of *polygenism*, and the acceptance that each stock or species has crossed the barrier from *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens* at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different periods in time, that we shall eventually have to interpret the races and stocks of mankind. This also pre-supposes that just as all men are not equal, neither are all these divisions of mankind identical in appearance and aptitudes. There is, of course, overlap, and so even where on average a stock may be less developed than another, some members of it will be equal with those of another group, just as some of that group will be below the average of the less well-endowed stock.

Not only the different horizons at which the major stocks have arisen will dictate that interpretation, of the inequality of mankind, but the variety of geographical environments within which each has evolved will reinforce differences between one major stock and the other. Finally stabilised cross-breeds will add further variations of differences or lack of similarity within the already highly complex groupings of men.

Consequently, the nearer any theory of classification comes to a *polygenic* interpretation such as I have enunciated in this paper, the more likely it is to be right.

Estyn Evans Appeal Fund

After 40 years as head of the Department of Geography at Queen's University, Belfast, Professor E. Estyn Evans relinquished the Chair in 1968 to take up a personal Chair in Irish Studies. In 1965 he was appointed Director of the University's newly founded Institute of Irish Studies. At the end of the 1969-70 academic year he retired from his Chair.

To mark this long and distinguished service and also the affection in which he was held by his colleagues, students and friends, it is proposed to establish an *Evans Fund* to finance an *Estyn Evans Lecture* to be given periodically in Queen's University on a subject perpetuating his interests, and an *Estyn Evans Prize* to be awarded annually in the Department of Geography, Queen's University. The target is a capital sum of at least £2,500 ($6,250).

Donations should be sent to

Mr N. C. Mitchell or Mr V. C. R. Ford,
Department of Geography
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, BELFAST, N. IRELAND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American School of Ethnology

By DONALD A. SWAN

During the first half of the nineteenth century the United States of America was the scene of a prolonged intellectual controversy concerning the origin of the races of man, the cause and significance of racial differences, and the possible conflict of slavery with democratic egalitarian ideals and Christian principles. Although the foundations of the new science of anthropology had been established in several European countries in the eighteenth century, the unique American situation of three diverse races — White, Negro, and Indian — in prolonged contact led to the development in the United States of the first school of scientific racial anthropology.

The "American School of Ethnology," as it later came to be called, developed as part of a movement of thought which embraced the entire Western world and which was concerned with the application of scientific methods in place of traditional theology to answer questions about the antiquity of man and the origin and formation of races.[1] It is the purpose of this article to outline the historical background of the American School of Ethnology, briefly to describe the leading members of the school and their intellectual and scientific contributions, and to evaluate their work in the light of later scientific developments.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the influence of John Locke and the thinkers of the French Enlightenment had resulted in a generally uncritical acceptance of the concept of the "original and natural equality of all mankind" amongst the educated men of America and Western Europe. And although Jefferson himself doubted the equality of the Negro,[2] even in the American South slavery was defended

[1] William Stanton, *The Leopard's Spots: Scientific Attitudes towards Race in America, 1815-1859*, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1960.

[2] Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1782: "To these objections, which are political, may be added others, which are physical and moral. The first difference which strikes us is that of color. . . . Comparing them by their faculties of memory, reason, and imagination, it appears to me that in memory they are equal to the whites; in reason much inferior, as I think one could scarcely be found capable of tracing and comprehending the investigations of Euclid; and that in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous. . . . But never yet could I find that a black had uttered a thought above the level of plain narration." From "Notes on Virginia," in *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Adrienne Koch and William Peden, the Modern Library, New York, 1944. pp. 255-258.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more as a necessary evil. Many Southern leaders, for example, considered plans for the freeing of their slaves and their eventual repatriation to Africa. In the words of one historian, "the eighteenth-century concept of equality was a scientific concept; it rested upon biology, the descent of all men from the Creation; it rested upon morphology, the similarity of men's bodies; and it emphasized the importance of environment in shaping men's biological and mental structure."[3] American writers of this period, such as Samuel Stanhope Smith (1787), who taught moral philosophy at Princeton College, claimed an unlimited plasticity and adaptability for the human constitution and attributed racial differences in physical and mental characteristics to the effects of climate and lack of opportunity.[4]

However, as Stanton (1960) notes, the French egalitarians and Locke "had never lived in proximity to Negroes or Indians." while "Americans did."[5] And while most Americans might have admitted the equality of all White men, many had serious doubts about extending the concept of equality to the other two racial groups. It was inevitable, therefore, that the development of the new science of anthropology should lead American scholars to devote much serious thought to the problem of the origin of the various races, as well as the cause and significance of racial differences.

For in the eighteenth century anthropology began to develop as a science in several European countries.[6] In 1735 the great Swedish naturalist and taxonomist, Carl von Linnaeus, published his famous classification system which encompassed all nature and became the first to classify man on the principles of natural science.[7] Shortly after, the French naturalist, Georges L. L. Buffon

[3] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[4] Samuel Stanhope Smith, *Essay on the Causes of the Variety of Complexion and Figure in the Human Species,* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1787.

[5] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[6] Gerhard Heberer, "The History of Anthropology," *Anthropology: A to Z* (edited by Carleton S. Coon and Edward E. Hunt), Grosset and Dunlap, New York, 1963, pp. 113-114. "As is true of almost all the sciences, allusions to anthropology may be found in the writings of the ancients (Aristotle, Galen). The term 'anthropology' goes back to Aristotle, but is not used again in antiquity. During the Middle Ages, no real progress could be made in the search for the place of man in nature."

[7] Carl von Linnaeus, *Systema Naturae Per Regna Tria Naturae,* Laurentii Salvii, Stockholm, Sweden, 1735; Walter Scheidt, "The Concept of Race in Anthropology," *This is Race* (edited by Earl Count), Schumann, New York, 1950, p. 355. Scheidt wrote in 1924-25: "There stands on the threshold of development in the natural sciences the name of the great Swedish botanist, Carl von Linnaeus. The beginnings of anthropology in approximately the modern sense of the word, occur within his time, i.e., the first attempts to subdivide the category Homo on the principles of natural science."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1749), attempted to construct a theory of development and became one of the first to advance an explanation of the biological processes of race formation.[8]

However, the German scientist, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, is credited with being "the first to place anthropology on a rational basis" and is even described by some writers as "the Father of Anthropology."[9] Blumenbach (1775) assembled a large collection of skulls at the University of Goettingen and established the "foundations of race classification based on measurement."[10] Both the Scottish surgeon and anatomist, John Hunter (1775), and the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1775), sought a sound basis for the race concept and were the first to develop an

[8] Georges L. L. Buffon, *Histoire naturelle général et particulière, avec la description du Cabinet du Roi,* Paris, 1749; Walter Scheidt, *op. cit.,* pp. 358-360. "Those best acquainted with his abundant writings state him to be an adherent or one of the first representatives of an evolutionary doctrine, and place him among the predecessors of Lamarck. Although Buffon has many reasons to avoid expressing his evolutionistic surmises and opinions with any clarity . . . still his rejection of the theory that species are constant stands exactly in contrast to the fundamentals in Linnaeus' thinking . . . Linnaeus and Buffon are the first and clear examples of the above-mentioned contrast in individual modes of thought. . . ."

"But Buffon's significance, as has been said, lies less in his classification than in his attempts to find an explanation of the biological processes of race formation and to obtain the coherence of natural law for what he undertook to describe . . . it is Buffon's unchallenged service that he was the first great representative of a 'doctrine of epigenesis'; and in consideration of his theory of human race origins he can frankly be called the 'first anthropologist.' Finally, we must mention that, except for Maupertuis, Buffon was the first to seek a practical application of his studies of race, especially in their details of mortality statistics; and so he is one of the first social biologists we know about. . . ."

[9] Alfred C. Haddon, *History of Anthropology,* Watts, London, 1934, p. 13; Gerhard Heberer, *op. cit.,* p. 114. "Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1842) is regarded as the actual father of anthropology. His most important work, *De generis humani varietate nativa,* was the foundation for racial morphology."

[10] Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, *De generis humani varietate nativa,* Göttingen, Germany, 1775: Alfred C. Haddon, *op. cit.,* pp. 13-16; Walter Scheidt, *op. cit.,* p. 362. "It is Blumenbach's lasting service to have selected and brought together for use in anthropology whatever technical means for direct observation and inquiry that his age afforded. He probably was the first to pursue craniology according to a plan; and he paved the way for exploiting comparative anatomy, physiology, and psychology in the science of human variation as far as such a thing was possible in his day."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actual theory of race.[11] In the years that followed, the Dutch anatomist Pieter Camper introduced the "facial angle"; the Belgian astronomer Quetelet made statistical studies of human physical characteristics and introduced the concept of the "average man"; the Swedish anthropologist Anders Retzius developed anthropometric criteria such as the cephalic index and degree of prognathism.[12]

SAMUEL G. MORTON — COLLECTOR OF HUMAN CRANIA AND STUDENT OF COMPARATIVE ANATOMY

Against this background, a Philadelphia physician and professor of anatomy, Dr Samuel George Morton, began in 1820 to collect, measure and compare human crania from all over the world. As Dr Morton's collection expanded, he became convinced "that the different races displayed different head shapes" and that "cranial capacity and conformation, like color, was a distinctive racial character."[13] In his *Crania Americana,* which was published in 1839, Dr Morton[14] classified his collection of skulls according to Blumenbach's system of five races and listed 13 separate measurements for each cranium, including the internal

[11] John Hunter, *Disputatio inauguralis, quaedam de hominum varietatibus, et harum causis, exponens,* London, England, 1775; Immanuel Kant, *Von den verschiedenen Rassen der Menschen,* Zur Ankündigung der Vorlesungen der physischen Geographie im Sommerlehrahre, 1775; Walter Scheidt, *op. cit.,* pp. 361 and 372-373. "John Hunter is rightly considered one of the most meritorious precursors of a scientific raciology. He belongs in that tradition which has sought a sound basis for the race concept and a biological explanation of racial relationships rather than a rigid categorization and mere description.

"In this essay, the basic features of his theory of race are already completely developed, and the lectures that grew out of it are indisputably significant for being historically the first lectures on record about what today we call anthropology. One can say then, that Kant is to be credited as the first to have raised anthropology to the status of a self-dependent academic discipline, a curricular subject for the higher schools.

"Kant's fundamentally different position from that of his contemporaries in natural science is best revealed both by his emphasis upon theory and hypothesis, and also by the directions of his attention within the observable facts. Kant does not turn to the external traits and peculiarities to find what is common to a species or what is distinctive in a race; he turns to the living events of generation and heredity; to the maintenance of similarity or the tendency to alter in the descendants of definite ancestors; to the phenomena of hybridization and those of genetic behavior in the presence of different environments."

[12] Alfred C. Haddon, *op. cit.,* pp. 15-37; Walter Scheidt, *op. cit.,* pp. 354-391.

[13] William Stanton, *op. cit.,* p. 29.

[14] Samuel G. Morton, *Crania Americana: or, A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America, to which is Prefixed an Essay on the Varieties of the Human Species.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1839.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capacity. The results of these measurements were summarized in the following table:[15]

Races	*No. of skulls*	*Mean internal capacity (cubic inches)*	*Largest in series*	*Smallest in series*
Caucasian	52	87	109	75
Mongolian	10	83	93	69
Malay	18	81	89	64
American (i.e. Indian)	147	80	100	60
Ethiopian (i.e. Negro	29	78	94	65

In addition to his use of statistical measurements to describe racial differences, Morton also listed the physical and "moral" characteristics of the primary races of man:[16]

Races	*Moral characteristics*
Caucasian	Distinguished for the highest intellectual endowments.
Mongolian	Ingenious, imitative, and highly susceptible of cultivation.
Malay	Active, ingenious, and predaceous.
American (i.e. Indian)	Averse to cultivation, slow in acquiring knowledge, restless, revengeful, and fond of war.
Ethiopian (i.e. Negro)	Joyous, flexible, indolent, presenting a singular diversity of intellectual character with some tribes constituting the lowest grade of humanity.

Dr Morton's collection of crania included skulls from ancient Egypt and other nations of antiquity. The observed similarity between these and modern crania and the existence of racial differences as far back as 3,500 years earlier led Dr Morton to conclude that racial distinctions were permanent and that there was "a primal difference among men."[17] Furthermore, Morton contended that neither intellect nor skin color was determined by climate. In particular, he noted that the skulls of American Indians from all parts of the Western hemisphere displayed a remarkable conformity despite great variations in climate.[18] Dr Morton's study of cranial characteristics convinced him that the

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 290.
[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-9.
[17] Samuel G. Morton, *Brief Remarks on the Diversities of the Human Species, and on some Kindred Subjects*, Philadelphia, 1842, pp. 8-22.
[18] Samuel G. Morton, *An Inquiry into the Distinctive Characteristics of the Aboriginal Race of America*, Philadelphia, 1844.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Caucasian and American Indian were separate species. However, the Biblical dogma of the unity of the descent of man and the zoological concept of specific interfertility deterred Morton from advancing in *Crania Americana* (1839) the thesis that the races of man were distinct species, until more evidence was accumulated.[19]

GEORGE R. GLIDDON — ARCHAEOLOGIST, EGYPTOLOGIST AND CRITIC OF THE TRADITIONAL BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY

Nor was evidence of this nature long in coming forth. For in the early years of the nineteenth century advances in the field of geology and archaeological discoveries in Europe and the Middle East were causing scientists completely to revise their estimates of the length of time man had been roaming the earth.[20] The archaeological discoveries relating to the culture and history of ancient Egypt, in particular, aroused a wide interest on both an academic and a popular level in Europe and the United States. Therefore, in 1840 George R. Gliddon, the English-born ethnologist and archaeologist, arrived in the United States to deliver a series of popular lectures on Egyptology. Gliddon, who had corresponded previously with Dr Morton, contended that both the cranial evidence and the detailed portraits on the Egyptian monuments firmly established that the ancient Egyptians were Caucasians not Negroes. Furthermore, the great antiquity of the Egyptian monuments supported the view that racial distinctions were extremely ancient and cast serious doubt upon the then accepted Biblical chronology which fixed the date of the Creation as 4004 B.C.[21]

With the assistance of Gliddon, who provided a collection of skulls from the tombs of Egypt, Morton published an anthropological study of the inhabitants of ancient Egypt, which was entitled *Crania Aegyptiaca* (1844).[22] In these studies Dr Morton made the same careful measurements (including internal capacity) on each skull as in his earlier work and concluded that racial differences in cranial capacity had remained unchanged for 4000 years and that racial differences were "as old as the oldest records of our species."[23] Morton also noted that slavery was "among the

[19] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-43.

[20] Glyn Daniel, *A Hundred Years of Archaeology*, Duckworth, London, 1950, pp. 13-56; Alfred C. Haddon, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-59.

[21] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-50.

[22] Samuel G. Morton, *Crania Aegyptiaca: or Observations on Egyptian Ethnography, Derived from Anatomy, History, and the Monuments*, Philadelphia, 1844.

[23] Samuel G. Morton, "Summary of His Series of Observations on Egyptian Ethnography," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. III, 1843, pp. 115-118.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earliest of the social institutions of Egypt" and that the "social position of Negroes had been the same as it was in the nineteenth century, that of servants and slaves."[24]

The publication of *Crania Aegyptiaca* aroused widespread interest in academic circles and drew the praise of such renowned European scholars as Anders Retzius and James C. Prichard.[25] It also attracted a great deal of attention on a non-professional level, particularly in the American South. For by 1844 the climate of opinion in the South regarding slavery and racial equality had changed greatly from the early 1800s. The radical Jeffersonian egalitarians who deplored the existence of slavery had been replaced by philosophers such as Albert Bledsoe, statesmen such as John C. Calhoun, and ministers such as Josiah Priest. Astute Southern leaders such as Governor James Hammond of South Carolina and Judge Mitchell King of Charleston, South Carolina, read Dr Morton's new book and immediately recognized that the doctrine of "the diversity of races" could offer "powerful support" to the South's "peculiar institutions."[26] John C. Calhoun, who had become Secretary of State in 1844, contacted Gliddon and Morton and began to use their anthropological material in controversies over slavery with European statesmen.[27]

JOSIAH NOTT — STUDENT OF RACIAL HYBRIDITY AND SPOKESMAN FOR THE DIVERSITY OF MAN

Among the Southerners who were attracted by the works of Gliddon and Morton was a distinguished Mobile, Alabama, physician named Josiah Nott. Dr Nott, who was a frequent contributor of articles to medical journals, ventured into the field of anthropology with an article published in 1843 in the *American Journal of the Medical Sciences* entitled "The Mulatto a Hybrid —Probable Extermination of the Two Races if the Whites and Blacks Are Allowed to Intermarry."[28] In this article Nott contended that Mulattoes were intermediate in intelligence between Caucasians and Negroes, less hardy and shorter lived than either of the parent races, and relatively infertile. Nott also described the physical and mental differences (i.e., the Negro had larger nerves, head of a different shape, a smaller brain and facial angle, and "intellectual powers comparatively defective"), and concluded that the Mulatto was a hybrid, the product of "two

[24] Samuel G. Morton, *Crania Aegyptiaca*, p. 59.
[25] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.
[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-63.
[28] Josiah C. Nott, "The Mulatto a Hybrid — Probable Extermination of the Two Races If the Whites and Blacks are Allowed to Intermarry," *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*, Vol. VI, 1843, pp. 252-256.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distinct species — as the mule from the horse and the ass."[29] Dr Nott's article elicited a cordial letter from Dr Morton and encouraged Nott to devote a considerable portion of his time to lecturing and writing in the field of ethnology.[30]

In 1845 Dr Nott published his *Two Lectures on the Natural History of the Caucasian and Negro Races* in which he contended that on the basis of the Egyptian archaeological evidence racial characteristics, physical and "moral," had remained unchanged for 4000 years.[31] Furthermore, by applying to man the natural law that certain species of plants and animals were "suited to certain climates and soils and no other," Nott concluded that the races of man were created separately in the different regions of the earth and should be classified as separate species. Ignoring the traditional criterion that the test of specific separation is the inability to produce fertile offspring. Nott defined species as "a race of Animals or Plants, marked by peculiarities of structure" which had "always been constant and undeviating."[32] In other parts of his lectures, Dr Nott defended slavery as the only alternative to racial amalgamation, which would result in the biological deterioration of the two races, and sharply criticized the Biblical chronology and account of creation as full of absurdities and contradictions. The publication of Nott's book aroused immediate controversy and opposition, particularly on the part of clergymen, since he not only attacked the Archbishop Usher's chronology, but also became the first American scientist to state publicly that the various races of man, being permanent and lacking in adaptability, had been created separately in their different environments.[33] And although Dr Nott was the first to proclaim the doctrine of the diversity of the races — a position which Morton and Gliddon were also nearing — other prominent scientists were soon to lend their support.

E. GEORGE SQUIER — DISCOVERER OF THE ANTIQUITY OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

On the basis of his earlier study of the skulls of the American Indians (*Crania Americana*), Dr Morton had concluded on anatomical and physiological grounds that the Indians were a distinct race. However, the historical and archaeological evidence, comparable to that which Gliddon had supplied for Egypt, of the antiquity of Indian settlement in America was at that time

[29] *Ibid.*
[30] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
[31] Josiah C. Nott, *Two Lectures on the Natural History of the Caucasian and Negro Races*, Mobile, Alabama, 1844, pp. 6-11.
[32] Josiah C. Nott, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-19, 29-34, 40-41.
[33] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-71.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lacking. In the mid-1840s E. George Squier, a New York-born journalist, diplomat and archaeologist, sought to provide this evidence by carefully investigating the large rounded earthworks, which were found scattered throughout the mid-West. Beginning with the terraces deposited by subsiding rivers in Ohio, Squier found mounds on all but the most recent — clear stratigraphic evidence for a far greater antiquity of settlement in America than had been previously supposed. Squier sent Dr Morton several skulls of these early Mound Builders, and asked him to compare them with crania from both the ancient Peruvian civilization and modern Indian tribes. After carefully measuring and comparing the two sets of skulls, Morton concluded that the skulls found by Squier manifested all the " features characteristic of the American (Indian) race."[34]

Squier's scientific survey of the mounds of the West, together with Morton's conclusions as to the identity of the Mound Builders, was published in 1848 by the Smithsonian Institution under the title *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*. Squier's research, which established that the mounds were so ancient that they could be dated only by geological means and that they were built by American Indians, led to the conclusion that the Indians had been in America as long as the Negroes had been in Africa.[35] Since the chronology of Archbishop Usher which fixed the date of creation at 4004 B.C. was the accepted framework of reference, each additional bit of evidence as to the antiquity of the races of man and their wide distribution in ancient times seemed only to strengthen the position of the " polygenists." As the time gap between the assumed date of creation and the first appearance of distinct races narrowed, it seemed certain that climate and environment, operating within this narrow span of time, could not account for the vast differences between the modern races of man. Therefore, the races must have been created separately in their separate environments. " Squier had done for the Indian what Gliddon had done for the Negro."[36]

LOUIS AGASSIZ — DEVELOPER OF THE ZOOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

While evidence for the diversity of man was being accumulated, the case for polygenism was greatly strengthened by the arrival in America in 1846 of the great Swiss zoologist Louis

[34] E. George Squier and E. H. Davis, *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley; comprising the results of Extensive Original Surveys and Explorations*, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., 1848, pp. 304-306.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-89.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Agassiz. While a professor of natural history in Europe, Dr Agassiz had written a number of articles concerning the localization of various species of animals in their zoological provinces, which he contended to be evidence of their having been created in the specific regions they were to inhabit. Although Agassiz noted that "all organized beings, plants as well as animals, are confined to a special area," he refrained at that time from extending this concept to man.[37] However, the presence of diverse racial groups in the United States, and the intellectual controversy over the origin of the races, combined to change fundamentally Dr Agassiz's anthropological views. Shortly after his arrival in America, Agassiz met Dr Morton, whose scholarship and research in the field of raciology greatly impressed him. Of greater importance, however, in bringing Professor Agassiz over to the side of "diversity" was his first physical contact with Negroes in America.[38]

By 1850 Dr Agassiz was writing articles entitled "The Diversity of Origin of Human Races," in which he contended that "racial distinctions were primordial" and that environment and climate were insufficient factors to account for observed racial differences.[39] However, Agassiz's primary contribution to the "American School of Anthropology" was his "law of zoogeography." According to Agassiz, the geographical distribution of specifically adapted and markedly distinct races of man demonstrated that these races inhabited distinct zoological provinces and that they "did not originate from a common centre, nor from a single pair."[40] The "permanence" of racial distinctions (as demonstrated by the Egyptian monuments) and

[37] Louis Agassiz, *Notice sur la géographie des animaux*, Neuchatel, Switzerland, 1845.

[38] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 103. "Impressive as Morton's anthropological Golgotha was, it was nothing compared to the living anthropological specimens who waited table in Agassiz's hotel in Philadelphia. Never before having been in such proximity to Negroes, Agassiz was shocked. A long and revealing passage described to his mother his first impressions of black men. Their color, he reported, their peculiar limbs and hands, large lips, and black heads topped with wool instead of hair inspired such a fascination of disgust that he must have stared most discourteously, and when his waiter approached, he could hardly refrain from bolting the room. The experience convinced him, he wrote, that, though the Negro was human, he was not of the same species as the white man. The fact that these beings lived in such great numbers in the southern states would some day, he predicted, cause the downfall of the Republic. . . . Even the abolitionists, who were fighting for equal political rights for the Negro, did not allow their daughters to marry them."

[39] Louis Agassiz, "The Diversity of the Origin of Human Races," *Christian Examiner*, Vol. XLVIII, 1850, pp. 181-204.

[40] Louis Agassiz, *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. III, 1850, pp. 106-107.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the apparent inability of climate to cause racial differences (as demonstrated by the uniform appearance of the American Indians) led Agassiz to conclude that the races of man, like the animals and plants inhabiting the same regions, must have been separately created "within those districts which they were naturally to inhabit for a certain time."[41] The addition of a scientist as eminent as Louis Agassiz to the side of the "polygenists" not only increased their rapidly growing academic stature but also led to a series of attacks from Christian clergymen and northern Abolitionists who objected to his open espousal of the "heretical" doctrine of the diverse origin and the innate inequality of the races of man.[42]

HYBRIDIZATION AND THE SPECIES CONCEPT

Although anthropological and archaeological evidence was being rapidly accumulated in support of the thesis that the races of man were separate species and had been created in different areas of the world, the one weak link in the "polygenist" argument was the taxonomic concept of specific identity. Since the time of Linnaeus zoologists had accepted as a fundamental axiom of taxonomy the rule that species rarely cross and that if they do cross, the offspring are sterile. Conversely, if the hybrid offspring of two varieties are fertile, then their parents must belong to the same species.[43] Dr Nott and a number of authorities had contended that Mulattoes were relatively infertile and were dying out as a population group. However, the evidence in support of this view was not adequate to withstand scientific criticism. Therefore, in the late 1840s Dr Morton decided to conduct a thorough study of the problem of hybridization and the concept of specific identity.

The results of Dr Morton's study were published in 1847 in the *American Journal of Science* in an article entitled "Hybridity in Animals, considered in reference to the question of the Unity of the Human Species."[44] Morton reviewed the scientific literature on hybridity and noted the great difficulty that naturalists had in defining the concept of species aside from the criterion of interfertility. Furthermore, he cited numerous instances of hybrids among groups of birds, fishes, insects and plants with such characteristic structural peculiarities that any naturalist would

[41] Louis Agassiz, "Geographical Distribution of Animals," *Christian Examiner*, Vol. XLVIII, pp. 181-204.

[42] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-112.

[43] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

[44] Samuel G. Morton, "Hybridity in Animals, considered in reference to the question of the Unity of the Human Species," *American Journal of Science*, Second Series, Vol. III, 1847, pp. 39-50, 203-212.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

designate them as species. Dr Morton then concluded that there were degrees of hybridization which coincided with the close structural relationship between species that all naturalists had observed.[45] In a subsequent article, Morton contended that species might be classified according to their degree of hybridization, such as:[46]

1. "Remote species" — species which failed to produce offspring when crossed;

2. "Allied species" — species which produced sterile offspring when crossed, such as numerous species of domestic birds, or which produced hybrids capable of reproduction only through back-crosses with either parent, such as crosses of domestic cattle with the American buffalo;

3. "Proximate species" — species which produced fertile offspring when crossed, such as horses, sheep, goats, dogs, and man.

On the basis of these findings, Morton concluded that hybridization could no longer be used as a definition or test of species. He noted, for example, "the repugnance of some human races to mix with others" which had "only been partially overcome by centuries of proximity, and, above all other means, by a moral degradation consequent to the state of slavery." "Thus the very phenomenon of repugnance that prevented the crossing of feral species became, when applied to man, a test of specificity."[47] Morton also felt that the discovery of geographical distribution and the great antiquity of species further invalidated the hybridization test of species.[48] The importance and relationship of these two discoveries to the concept of species was noted in the following manner. Arguing within the framework of the Usherian chronology which fixed the date of Creation at 4004 B.C. and noting the existence of distinct races and species in ancient Egypt, Dr Morton pointed out that the structural forms of men and animals had "preserved their identity through such vast periods of time" in the "most diversified climates."[49] Therefore, Morton concluded that at least some of these forms were "essential primeval types" and that *species* could better be

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Samuel G. Morton, "Some Remarks on the Value of the word *Species* in Zoology," *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia,* Vol. V, 1850, pp. 81-82.

[47] Samuel G. Morton, 1847, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-50, 203-212.

[48] Samuel G. Morton. "Additional Observations on Hybridity in Animals, and on some collateral subjects . . ." *Charleston Medical Journal,* Vol. V, 1850, pp. 755-805.

[49] Samuel G. Morton, "Additional Observations on the Antiquity of Some Races of Dogs," *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia,* Vol. V, 1850, pp. 85-89.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defined as " a primordial organic form." The races of man were thus " proximate species," capable of producing fertile hybrids, and characterized by a " disparity of primordial organization."[50]

PETER A. BROWNE — STUDENT AND COLLECTOR OF HUMAN HAIR

By 1850 the principle tenets of the doctrine of polygenism were generally accepted by the majority of American scientists. The 1850 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, for example, devoted a considerable portion of time to the question of the unity or diversity of mankind.[51] Dr Samuel S. Kneeland, a Boston naturalist and supporter of diversity, contributed a paper on " Characteristics of the Hindoo Skull," which confirmed Morton's earlier measurements of Hindu crania.[52] Dr Nott sent a paper entitled " An Examination of the Physical History of the Jews, in its bearings on the Question of the Unity of the Races." In this paper, Nott demonstrated, on the basis of pictorial representations of Jews on the ancient Egyptian monuments and the similarity of ancient and modern Jewish crania, that the physical characteristics of the Jews had remained constant for 4000 years although the Jews had lived " in all the climates, and under all forms of government of the earth."[53] Dr Agassiz noted that the geographical distribution of the races of man demonstrated that " these races did not originate from a common centre, nor from a single pair," but were separately created in their distinct zoological provinces.[54]

The final paper was presented by Peter A. Browne, a Pennsylvania geologist and attorney, who had collected, measured, and compared human hair with the same care and precision that had characterized Dr Morton's earlier study of human crania. Using a special microscope-like device, called a " trichometer," which he had invented to measure the various properties of hair and

[50] Samuel G. Morton, " Additional Observations on Hybridity in Animals. and on some collateral subjects," *op. cit.*, pp. 755-805; Samuel G. Morton, " Notes on Hybridity. designed as a supplement to the memoir on that subject in the last number of this Journal," *Charleston Medical Journal*, Vol. VI, 1851, pp. 145-152.

[51] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

[52] Samuel S. Kneeland, " Characteristics of the Hindoo Skull," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. III, 1850, pp. 34-38.

[53] Josiah C. Nott, " An Examination of the Physical History of the Jews, in its bearing on the Question of the Unity of the Races," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. III, 1850, pp. 98-106.

[54] Louis Agassiz, " A Correction of Some Mis-statements," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. III, 1850, pp. 106-107.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wool, Browne discovered that there were distinct racial differences in hair shape and structure.[55] The hair of the Caucasian was found to be oval in shape, that of the Indian cylindrical, and that of the Negro "eccentrically elliptical." In addition to racial variations in hair shape, Browne found that Caucasian hair was pierced by a central canal, while Negro hair had "no central canal." Due to the larger number of "scales upon the cortex of the pile," the hair of the Negro was capable of "felting" in a manner similar to sheep's wool, whereas Caucasian hair was not.[56] After examining the hair from several Egyptian and Peruvian mummies and noting its identity with the hair of living representatives of these races, Browne concluded that hair-type was also a permanent racial character.[57] Furthermore, Browne noted that hair from hybrids consisted of filaments characteristic of each of the parent races and that by close observation of the hair he could determine the degree of hybridity of any given individual.[58] As Stanton (1960) observed: "Browne's investigations thus substantiated the conclusions reached by the 'American School' of anthropologists. They indicated that the races had separate origins and constituted separate species, and they captured the Egyptians for the White species."[59]

POLYGENISM REACHES THE PUBLIC

Now that the American scientific community had been won over to "polygenism, it was necessary to present the tenets of the American school of anthropology to the people generally. With the death of Dr Morton in 1851, this task was left to Nott and Gliddon, since Agassiz had become immersed in the study of fishes and Squier was busy building a railroad across Central America.[60]

After lecturing extensively and writing numerous articles for scientific journals, Nott and Gliddon decided to edit and publish

[55] Peter A. Browne, "A Microscopic Examination and Description of some of the Piles of the Head of Albinos," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. III, 1850, pp. 108-114.

[56] Peter A. Browne, *The Classification of Mankind, by the Hair and Wool of their Heads, with an Answer to Dr Prichard's Assertion . . .*, Philadelphia, 1850, pp. 1, 8 and 20.

[57] Peter A. Browne, *The Classification of Mankind, by the Hair and Wool of their Heads, with an Answer to Dr Prichard's Assertion . . .*, p. 13; Peter A. Browne, "Examination of the Hair of the Head of a Mummy, unrolled in Philadelphia in January 1851," *Charleston Medical Journal*, Vol. VI, 1851, pp. 371-372.

[58] Peter A. Browne, *The Classification of Mankind, by the Hair and Wool of their Heads, with the Nomenclature of Human Hybrids*, Philadelphia, 1852.

[59] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

[60] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a comprehensive one-volume summary of all the anthropological evidence available which supported the concept of the specific diversity of mankind. The book, which was entitled *Types of Mankind*, was published in 1854, and was dedicated to the memory of George S. Morton. The first part of the work was written by Nott and contained chapters on the different physical types of man, " Hybridity of Animals," " Comparative Anatomy of Races," Geographical Distribution of Animals and the Races of Men," " Physical History of the Jews," and so on. The second part was written by Gliddon and contained sections on Egyptian archaeology and Biblical criticism, and an attack on the traditional Biblical chronology. Professor Henry Patterson contributed a biographical sketch on the life and work of Dr Morton. Dr Agassiz added a section on the geographical distribution of animals and the races of man, and Dr William Usher furnished a chapter on " Geology and Palaeontology."[61]

In 1857 Nott and Gliddon published a second volume entitled *Indigenous Races of the Earth*. The volume began with a letter from Professor Agassiz on geographical distribution and one from Professor Leidy on palaeontology. Dr Alfred Maury contributed a chapter on the philological evidence for diversity. Francis Pulszky wrote a section " Iconographic Researches on Human Races and their Art." Professor J. Aitken Meigs, who had become the curator of Morton's skull collection, contributed a chapter on " The Cranial Characteristics of the Races of Men." Nott wrote an article on " Acclimation; or the Comparative Influence of Climate, Endemic and Epidemic Diseases, on the Races of Men." Gliddon added a chapter summarizing the historical and archaeological evidence for diversity and concluded the book with one section enumerating racial differences and another on geographical distribution.[62]

Both *Types of Mankind* and *Indigenous Races of the Earth* were favorably received in American scientific circles.[63] However, the publication of these two volumes did result in a violent reaction on the part of many Christian clergymen and Northern

[61] Josiah C. Nott and George R. Gliddon, *Types of Mankind: or, Ethnological Researches, based upon the Ancient Monuments, Paintings, Sculptures, and Crania of Races, and upon their Natural Geographical, Philological, and Biblical History*, J. B. Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1854.

[62] Josiah C. Nott and George R. Gliddon, *Indigenous Races of the Earth; or, New Chapters of the Ethnological Inquiry; including Monographs on Special Departments of Philology, Iconography, Cranioscopy, Palaeontology, Pathology, Archaeology, Comparative Geography, and Natural History*, J. B. Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1857.

[63] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 173. " This exchange, in effect, marked the end of the scientific controversy over the unity of the human species, for Bachman, the only scientist who openly attacked the doctrine of diversity, now devoted his time to the studies of his profession."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abolitionists. A reviewer of *Types of Mankind* for the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, for example, contended that the ideas expressed by Nott and Gliddon would bring to "helpless, remediless degradation many of the races of mankind; and all but the Caucasian to final extinction" and would even "unsettle the faith of men in our holy religion."[64]

One American historian[65] who surveyed these reviews recently observed:

> In the reviews of Nott's and Gliddon's two books all the elements in the traditional pattern of theological accommodation to science were present: complete denunciation of the new theory and reaffirmation of revelation on the subject, followed by sponsorship of a quasi-scientific hypothesis (that climate determines variation), terminating in acceptance of the new theory — signified by assertions that science must not attack revelation, for Scripture was not intended as a textbook of science.

GOBINISM AND THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ETHNOLOGY

At about the same time the works of Nott and Gliddon were being circulated in the United States, Count Arthur de Gobineau's influential racial interpretation of history was published in Europe. In his four-volume work *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* (1853-1855), de Gobineau sought the explanation of "the fall of civilizations."[66] Analyzing existing hypotheses, de Gobineau contended that "fanaticism, luxury, corruption of morals, and irreligion do not necessarily lead to the fall of societies," that "the relative merit of governments has no influence on the length of a nation's life," and that "Christianity neither creates nor changes the capacity for civilization."[67]

According to de Gobineau, the progress or decay of a society is determined by race. In his view, the races of man are unequal, with some races capable of creating civilization and culture and other races incapable. Since institutions and laws were held to be manifestations of race traits, de Gobineau therefore concluded that "a people and their civilization dies out when the people's fundamental racial constitution is changed or engulfed among

[64] "Types of Mankind: A Review," *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, Vol. XIII, 1854, pp. 177-217.

[65] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

[66] Arthur de Gobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races*, Putnam, New York, 1915, p. 1.

[67] Arthur de Gobineau, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-18, 19-22 and 63-76.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other races to the degree that it ceases to exert the necessary influence."[68]

As a result of de Gobineau's " clearness and logicity of ideas," " unusual erudition," and excellence of style, his " book made, and makes up to this time, a strong impression " and " gave a great impetus to many other racial theories."[69] Some later writers have even attributed to de Gobineau a strong influence on American racial thought in the first half of the nineteenth century.[70] Simpson and Yinger (1953), for example, assert that de Gobineau's racial theory " was popular among the slave-owners of the Old South in the years preceding the Civil War."[71]

However, a study of American writings on race prior to the Civil War indicates that de Gobineau had little, if any, influence upon the American school of ethnology or American racial thinking of this period. The American school was an independent American product, whose principle tenets were developed and advanced from 1840 to 1850 i.e., prior to the publication of de Gobineau's work in 1853. And while de Gobineau made use of Morton's anthropological studies,[72] there is no evidence that Morton, who died in 1851, knew of de Gobineau.

Furthermore, we learn from the later publication by Schemann (1910) of the correspondence between Nott, Gliddon and de Gobineau that Nott and Gliddon did not become aware of de Gobineau's work until 1854-1855 — in other words, until after the publication of *Types of Mankind* (1854).[73] Nott and Gliddon were, nevertheless, sufficiently impressed by the work to arrange for a one-volume English translation of the *Essay on the Inequality of Human Races* by Henry Hotz, a Swiss journalist who had migrated to Alabama.[74] However, Nott felt compelled to add a lengthy appendix on hybridity to correct " de Gobineau's failure " to recognize that the races of man were separate species with multiple origins. Nott attributed this " failure " to de

[68] Arthur de Gobineau, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-53.

[69] Pitirim Sorokin, " Anthropo-Racial, Selectionist, and Hereditarist School, *Contemporary Sociological Theories*, Harper, New York, 1928, pp. 222-229. " The chapters of the book devoted to the criticism of different environmental theories are still valid in their essential objections to the environmentalism and are quite fresh even at the present moment."

[70] Anne Anastasi, *Differential Psychology*, Macmillan, New York, 1958, p. 542. " Particularly influential in popular thinking was the theory proposed a little over a century ago by de Gobineau . . ."

[71] George E. Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities*, Harper, New York, 1953, pp. 34-35.

[72] Arthur de Gobineau, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-112.

[73] Ludwig Schemann, *Gobineau's Rassenwerk*, Frommans, Stuttgart, 1910, pp. 190-192.

[74] Ludwig Schemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-206.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gobineau's Catholicism and his "want of accurate knowledge" in natural history.[75]

DARWINISM AND THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ETHNOLOGY

Despite the great influence attained by the American School of Ethnology in shaping American racial thinking in the years prior to 1860, two quite distinct and unrelated events contributed to bring about a decline of the school. These were the American Civil War (1861-1865) and the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859).

As a consequence of the increase in sectional feelings accompanying the Civil War, some Northern abolitionists and Christian clergymen charged that the doctrine of diversity was a deliberate construction of Southerners and Southern sympathizers interested in upholding and furthering the institution of slavery. This view has persisted among some writers even up to the present day.

However, as Stanton (1960) demonstrates, this charge is without foundation. Of the founders of the American school, only Josiah Nott showed any evidence of furthering political ends through research. Squier wrote that he had a "precious poor opinion of niggers, or any of the darker races," but he had "a still poorer one of slavery."[76] In the view of Stanton, "the conscious extrascientific bond which linked many of these men together was not sympathy for Southern institutions but anticlericalism and antibiblicism."[77] Aside from John C. Calhoun and some of the intellectual and political leaders of South Carolina, the majority of the South rejected the support of the American School because of its attack on Biblical chronology and preferred instead to rest its defense of slavery upon the traditional theological arguments.[78]

Of far greater importance, however, was the publication of Charles Darwin's work in 1859. Darwin's theory of evolution undermined the basic foundations of "polygenism" since it made unnecessary the hypothesis of a multiplicity of creations. All forms of life could now be derived from an original one through natural selection over geological epochs of those variations best adapted to their particular environment.

Whereas the "polygenists" had adopted the thesis of "multiple creations" as the best possible explanation of the existence of racial types identical with those of the present day at a time close to the Biblically established date of creation

[75] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-175.
[76] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 193.
[77] *Ibid.*
[78] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-196.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4004 B.C.), Darwin had completely ignored the Biblical chronology and provided for the development of species and a continuity of life accompanied by gradual and barely perceptible change over a time span that encompassed hundreds of thousands if not millions of years.

Although Morton and Gliddon had died prior to the publication of Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859), the reaction of Agassiz and Nott to Darwinism provided a striking contrast. Agassiz spent the rest of his life vainly attempting to stop the tide of Darwinism and uphold the theory of "multiple creations." Nott, however, immediately accepted Darwin's evolutionary biology and fitted his prior racial studies within this new framework. As Stanton notes, "even if the differences between Negro and White which Nott had been documenting for 20 years had emerged as Darwin suggested, they nevertheless existed. They might not be permanent according to Darwin's way of thinking, but in the framework of that man's thought, nothing was."[79] In an article entitled "Instincts of Races," which he wrote in 1866, Dr Nott pointed out that each race had its own "moral and physical laws" and that "all the power of the Freedmen's Bureau or 'gates of hell' cannot prevail against them, (for) forms that have been permanent for several thousand years, must remain so at least during the life time of a nation." [80]

Furthermore, in his own writings Darwin (1871) firmly maintained that the races of man were "very distinct" in their mental traits as well as their physical, even though he believed them to be of one species.[81] Thus, most of the racial questions which were the concern of the American school of ethnology in the first half of

[79] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

[80] Josiah C. Nott, "Instincts of Races," *New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal*, Vol. XIX, 1866, pp. 1-16 and 145-156; Josiah C. Nott, "The Problem of the Black Races," *De Bow's Review*, New Series, Vol. I, 1866, pp. 266-270.

[81] Charles C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, Modern Library, New York, 1871, p. 530. "There is, however, no doubt that the various races, when carefully compared and measured, differ much from each other — as in the texture of the hair, the relative proportions of all parts of the body, the capacity of the lungs, the form and capacity of the skull, and even in the convolutions of the brain. But it would be an endless task to specify the numerous points of difference. The races differ also in constitution, in acclimatisation and in liability to certain diseases. Their mental characteristics are likewise very distinct; chiefly as it would appear in their emotional, but partly in their intellectual faculties. Every one who has had the opportunity of comparison must have been struck with the contrast between the taciturn, even morose, aborigines of South America and the light-hearted, talkative Negroes. There is a nearly similar contrast between the Malays and the Papuans, who live under the same physical conditions, and are separated from each other only by a narrow space of sea."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the nineteenth century continued to remain a source of intellectual discussion. Only now these questions were argued within the framework of Darwinian evolutionary biology. And in the United States, racial thought in the last half of the nineteenth century became shaped by the new school of Social Darwinism.[82]

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

During the first half of the nineteenth century scientific thinking on race in the United States became shaped and dominated by a school of thought that was later termed the "American school of ethnology." The American school of ethnology comprised many of the leading scientists of this period, including: Professor Samuel G. Morton, who provided evidence of quantitative racial differences in cranial capacity and skull shape; E. George Squier, who demonstrated the antiquity of Indian settlement in North America; Professor Louis Agassiz, who developed the zoological concept of geographical distribution; Peter A. Browne, who described racial differences in hair shape and structure; George R. Gliddon, who informed America of the latest archaeological findings in Egypt and demonstrated the existence of racial differences in ancient Egypt; and Dr Josiah C. Nott, who studied hybridity and informed both the scientific community and the general public of the findings of the American school. In the light of the archaeological findings of this period, the members of the American school of ethnology became convinced of the antiquity of racial origins, the permanence of racial differences, and the stability of racial types. Evaluating their findings against the time scale of the traditional Biblical chronology, the American school concluded that the primary races of man were distinct species who had been separately created in different zoogeographical environments.

As a result of the work of Darwin later historians have tended to discredit and downgrade the American school of anthropology — a judgment which is both unfair and unwarranted. For in the application of precise quantitative methods to determine racial differences in cranial capacity and hair shape, their use of the latest archaeological evidence from Egypt and America to establish the great antiquity of racial types and their penetrating analysis of the effect of climate and environment on racial characteristics, Morton, Nott, Gliddon, Agassiz, Browne and Squier proved themselves to be the scientific leaders of their day. Even their development of the doctrine of separate creations or "polygenism" was a logical consequence of trying to fit the

[82] Richard Hofstadter. *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1955.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discovery of the antiquity of the races of man within the framework of the traditional Biblical chronology. As Dr Stanton (1960) concludes,[83] "the American School was part of a movement of thought and feeling that comprehended the entire Western world. The peculiarly American cast their work assumed arose not from its motivation but from the subject matter on which these motives spent themselves — the characteristic American situation of three races in uneasy conjunction." Indeed, the American school of ethnology constitutes an integral part of the intellectual and cultural heritage of the United States.

[83] William Stanton, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

IMPORTANT REPRINT

Practical Considerations which are Fundamental in Bantu Affairs in Rhodesia and for an Understanding of Negroid-Caucasoid Problems Generally

by R. GAYRE OF GAYRE

Reprinted from THE MANKIND QUARTERLY
Vol. X., No. 2, October-December 1969
12½p $0.50

Published by

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

1 DARNAWAY STREET, EDINBURGH. EH3 6DW, SCOTLAND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Social Stratification of Mayan Civilisation during the Classic Period (A.D. 600-900)

By AZZO GHIDINELLI

THE SOCIAL STRATIFICATION: THE SACERDOTAL ELITE, THE NOBLES, THE PEASANTS AND OTHER MINOR GROUPS (ARTISANS, MERCHANTS AND SLAVES)

The Classic Period, the height of Mayan splendor, was also the period of maximum differentiation in the social structure. The stratification of this society was characterized by an élite of priests with a full capacity of power, followed by strata of nobles (functionaries), of artisans or artists, of merchants, of peasants (a majority) and lastly of slaves, almost always foreigners or convicts who had violated the customs. Of this social stratification, we have the elements and sources necessary to make a detailed study only of the social élite and the peasant community. For the other strata, information is both uncertain and ambiguous due to the scarcity of sources.

As in all societies, a distinction can be made between those who govern and those who are governed. In the Mayan society, a very small number governed; they handled all political functions and monopolized the power, enjoying all of the advantages that went with it. The majority of Maya were directed and regulated by the ruling group according to certain customs, which had been developed through centuries of civilization. The ruling group was composed of priests, that is, persons invested with both physical and mental qualities and considered to be supernatural (not accessible or comprehensible to everyone).

The beginning of the social stratification dates back to the Archaic period when the level of production permitted this rising élite of priests to disengage themselves from active participation in food production and to dedicate themselves strictly to the study of celestial space. More specifically, this study was directed towards the attainment of knowledge of the phenomena of the environment and of the supernatural with the purpose of becoming part of the rhythm of nature; and thus being able to regulate the agricultural production and supply an ever-increasing abundance of goods. This last purpose is not to be ignored, as otherwise we are running the risk of mystifying the rôle of the élite.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The supernatural character of the Mayan priests is revealed in abundant archaeological sources, such as the stele, the bas-reliefs and the paintings on vases and walls which represent deities wearing sacerdotal clothes. Also the ornaments worn by the priests have a divine symbolism. In all of the stele of Copan we can see ceremonial sceptres which have the appearance of a feathered bicephalic serpent symbolizing the Absolute Being, as shown in Figure I.

In examining ways of maintaining power utilized by this sacerdotal élite, we must first of all take into consideration the accumulation of prestige and charisma. The Mayan sacerdotal élite acted on the basis of their prestige and in order to accumulate more. In so doing, they were able to maintain the peasantry in submission. They demonstrated a moral and intellectual excellence and a magical and religious capacity, whether real or apparent. This responsibility corresponded to the peasantry's need for direction and leadership, the so-called *esigenza tutoria*[1].

Many aspects of the Mayan society have been understood and interpreted through ethnographic studies, such as that done by Rafael Girard[2] on the contemporary Chorti communities, in which he found that the priest is always a model of behavior for the peasant, maintaining a rigid morality in accordance with the canons of custom. This fact may possibly be a reflection of the distant historical and cultural roots from which these models of social relationships developed.

The intellectual excellency of the priests, in the sense that it meant an exclusive control of the most important scientific notions, including mathematics, astronomy, the calendar, and writing, allowed them to maintain their position in respect to the peasantry.

The charismatic character of the Mayan priest is problematic. According to Max Webber[3], the charismatic leader does nothing but assume the task expected of him and demand obedience in the name of this mission. We think this description duly corresponds with that of the Mayan priests. When the persons towards whom the High Priest feels his mission is directed refuse to acknowledge that mission, the authority of the High Priest collapses. For that reason, together with the personal qualities of the leader, collective confirmation was necessary.

The doubt as to whether to designate the power of the High Priest as charismatic or not arises in Weber's affirmation that

[1] Eugenio Pennati, *Elementi di Sociologia Politica,* Communita, Milan, 1969, p. 137.

[2] Rafael Girard, *Los Chortis Ante el Problema Maya: Historia de las Culturas Indigenas de America,* Lee Gonzalez Obregon, Mexico, 1949.

[3] Max Weber, "Carismatica e Tipi di Potere (Autorita)," *Nuova Collana di Economia,* Turin, 1936.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pure charisma is in opposition to every form of patriarchal control and every regulated economy. As we have already had occasion to mention, the Mayan society always had, except in the beginning, a strong patriarchal organization with an organized economy. Was the *Chilam Balam* or *Halach Uinic* a charismatic authority? The answer is problematic: considering Max Weber's definition, it does not seem to be of the pure type, but evidently there existed a certain charismatic power during the Classic Period, though weakened by the fact that the beginnings of bureaucracy had been introduced which, as we shall see, was the hypothetical function of the nobility in some ceremonial centers.

Probably during the Classic Period, there was not a pure charismatic authority such as that described by Weber. This type most likely could have been found at the dawn of Copan society, but when the cult for certain deities became permanent and impersonal, the charismatic magician and leader became a priest. Therefore, the very concept of "priest" indicates that the process of bureaucratization was already underway.

Many scholars have dedicated themselves to the study of political élites, but it is difficult to categorize the sacerdotal élite within these types and definitions. However, we might use a definition similar to the one of O. Stammer: the sacerdotal élite consists of a minority qualified on the basis of certain political, social, intellectual and religious characteristics and indicates the ruling strata of the hierarchical society. It is a small, guiding group recognized as qualified to command and direct the society which is bound by faithfulness and obedience to the High Priest. Most probably the élite was already institutionalized in the Classic Period; that is, that the right to rule and the capability of choosing were regulated systematically according to directives of customary character.

The High Priest, called *Halach Uinic* ("the real man") in the Yucatan, had only one legitimate wife, who had the right to the title of High Priestess and who accompanied her husband in the agrarian rites. She was invested with a responsibility held in high respect. In the mural paintings of *Bonampak*, the wife of the *Halach Uinic* appears with a flattened skull and pierced ears, adorned with earrings and necklaces. The hair is tied and plaited around the head; a white *huipil* is on her shoulders and a red shawl on her arms; a fan is in her hands.

Priests adorned with divine symbols or deities wearing sacerdotal clothes are represented everywhere in Copan, as in Figure I.

At the head of this sacerdotal élite were the hereditary dynasties whose members managed not only all the ecclesiastical functions but also those of high civil importance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FIGURE 1

Stele H in Copan (A.D. 782), shows the front of a stele sculptured with a feminine figure. This is the only stele in the archaeological zone of Copan where we find a sculptured feminine being. She wears a long skirt and two wide bands, one around her waist and another which falls to the ground. The position of the hands is identical to other masculine representations; i.e. they are on the chest holding a feathered, bicephalic serpent. She has big bracelets and large pendant earrings. The head is adorned with a headgear of long quetzal feathers and so it is very probable that she is a High Priestess. The wife of the High Priest also took part in the sacerdotal ceremonies because the worship of fertility, founded on the dualism of the sexes, was required for the performances of the relative ceremonies that the High Priest celebrated together with his companion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The economic activities in all the Mayan area were inseparable from the religious ones, and the prosperity of the ceremonial centers depended upon the sacerdotal power, then as it does today. The astronomical activities were also inseparable from religious ones; they were based not on the real movement of the stars but on the apparent movement. With an admirable exactness a priest could determine the periods of solstice and equinox.

The sacerdotal profession was, in all probability, hereditary and life-long, but the aspirant also had to merit the office. Behavior had to be modeled upon the ethic patterns of the culture and to be imitative of the qualities of God — power, justice and perfection. A High Priest had to be the legitimate representative of God on earth. In order to communicate with the deities, the priests had to keep themselves in a state of holiness by means of fasting, abstinence and other mortifications.

The sacerdotal élite contained the secret of all scientific knowledge of the Mayan civilization, and the people had to resign themselves to receiving the instruction through religious symbolism. The power of the priest was based on certain esoteric capacities and the revelation of them meant the loss of power and the incapability of protecting the people from the evil forces. It seems that during the Classic Period every High Priest was independent: each followed his own particular method and, due to direct inspiration by God, did not have to submit to any human law. It is because of this that in every ceremonial center we find a completely local art and externalization of worship.

Sources concerning the noble stratum are confusing because it is often difficult to distinguish the attire of the noble from that of the priest. However, we can classify the available information from archaeological and mythological sources. In some vases and mural paintings, we notice that the personages who follow the High Priest wear sumptuous clothes, very different from those of their chiefs, and this makes us think that they are not simple slaves. The *Popol Vuh*[4] speaks very clearly of *Naol Ahuchan* and of the hereditary nature of their task.

Naol Ahuchan is a Quiché word and means "orator, the one who knows, teacher of speech". Adrian Recinos explains that the *Naol Ahuchan* were officials of the *Halach Uinic* (High Priest), administrators, accountants and treasurers who lived in the surroundings of the ceremonial centers. The *Naol Ahuchan* also collected tributes and delivered the orders of *Halach Uinic* to the communities. In *Bonampak*, a sculptured panel shows the functionaries offering their gathered taxes to the High Priest.

In various ceremonial centers of the northwest part of the

[4] Adrian Recinos (translator), *Popol Vuh: The Sacred Book of the Ancient Quiché-Maya*, William Hodge, London, 1951, p. 120.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

central area, it appears that the functionaries practiced military functions as well. In Stele 12 of *Piedras Negras*, we find the nobles around the throne of the *Halach Uinic*. Near Miraflores in Peten, on a polychromic vase, two nobles in warrior clothes are seated on the ground listening to the instructions of the High Priest, who is sitting on his throne (A.D. 750). Panel VIII in *Yaxchilan* portrays the capture of two prisoners by the noble warriors, one of whom is called " Jaguar ".

We do not know what the peasants were called during the Classic Period, but in the oldest Mayan dictionaries we have, they were called *Ah Chembal, Uinicob, Memba Uinicob* and *Yalba Uinicob*.

Most of the Maya were peasants. They supported not only themselves but also the nobles and the sacerdotal élite. They provided the labor for the construction of the ceremonial centers. They had to pay tributes to the priests through the *Naol Ahuchan* and made offerings to the deities. The tributes and offerings consisted of every kind of agricultural product and others, including clothing, salt, birds, cocoa, copal, honey, wax, jade and shells.

In addition to the peasantry, a number of other minority groups existed. For example, there were the artisans, who worked permanently for the ceremonial centers. The *Popol Vuh* mentions the *ahqual*, one who works the jade; the *ahgol*, one who works the resin or the copal; the *ahchut*, one who carves the stele or the hieroglyphics on stone; and the *ahtzalam*, engraver or ebonist. These works required a technical ability and an artistic inspiration, and as a result they could not be entrusted to the common slaves or to the corvées of the peasants. Nor do we think they could have been done by the priests, who were considered semi-divine beings, or by the nobles, who were considered functionaries of the state.

In contrast to the artisans who worked for the ceremonial centers were artisans who dedicated themselves to commercial artisanry and merchants who marketed their products. It seems likely that such a group of persons came into existence during the Early Classic Period and increased in number during the Full Classic Period. Their existence is especially credible because of the unlikelihood that peasants, primarily devoted to agricultural production, could have produced all the necessary objects and also have had the time to market them.

The slaves, called *Ppentacob* in the Yucatec language, seem to have been in existence during the Classic Period, though Landa has written that slavery was introduced by the Lord Cocom of Mayapan only toward the end of the Post-Classic Period. This is difficult to believe, however, because of the frequent representation of the so-called captive figures on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monuments of the Classic Period. These scenes show prisoners-of-war made slaves and appear to be representations of mass groups rather than individuals. The faces of the figures in these scenes are sometimes of a different type than the principle figures. These Classic Period scenes come mainly from the north-western part of the central area (*Bonampak*, *Yaxchilan* and *Piedras Negras*). They are associated with those that signify a certain military activity. It is important to note that the prisoners in these scenes were not simply slaves, a point substantiated by the Quiché language in which the word *cana* means pledge, slave, hostage or prisoner.

In addition to the slavery of the northwestern part of the central area, there was the slavery in other ceremonial centers during the Full Classic Period. For example, slavery existed in Tikal where, in Tomb Number I of the temple, was found an engraved bone representing a prisoner with bound hands, arms and legs and with a hair style unlike that of the Mayan culture.

FORMATION OF THE SOCIAL STRATIFICATION CONSISTENCY OF THE RELATION BETWEEN THOSE WHO ARE GOVERNED AND THOSE WHO GOVERN

During the first phase of the Archaic Period, we find an embryonic social stratification in the division between the charismatic magician and the family communities. In the beginning, the Mayan family communities dedicated themselves to hunting and gathering, and progressively obtained their own alimentation from the horticulture and from the incipient cultivation of tubers. During this period the charismatic magician affirmed himself in his semi-divine rôle with the use of a lunar calendar, which permitted the making of a programme to a certain degree and direction of agricultural activities, and in turn a liberation of the peasant from the struggle to survive. An inventory of worship objects shows how their free time was spent. The charismatic magician was dedicated to the magician rites as well as to astronomical observations and astrology.

During a second phase of the Archaic Period, the structures became too complicated to be safeguarded by only one charismatic magician. It is probable that the magician instructed a small group of neophytes (perhaps sons and relations) and, as a result, we have the priesthood, which rose as an hereditary institution. Around the *Halach Uinic* were the *ahquih*, priests and soothsayers, and the *E nauinac chic*, the sagacious ones or magicians. Only from 500 B.C. on do we have the first archaeological proof of a well-delineated social stratification: simple, but well-ordered ceremonial centers demonstrated the existence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of organized ceremonies; the necropolises signified a pompous funereal ritual. The personal religious orientation towards the supernatural, which existed before 500 B.C. was replaced by an impersonal, rigid discipline. This discipline became necessary in order to have the security to act in harmony with the natural order. There was a sort of matriarchy. The horticulture was very advanced; the maize planted only once a year. Towards the end of the Archaic Period, there was a small, organized élite of priests who had refined the lunar calendar as a consequence of the considerable progress in astronomy and astrology. The priests, as evidenced by archaeological testimonies, were considered spokesmen of the divinity. The testimonies indicate the beginning of huge artistic activities and building industries to the service of the supernatural beings. The art of painting began and with it rigid, monolithic sculpture and feminine idols on wood. The society became patriarchal. It seems there were several tribes, each one with its own ceremonial center.

During all the Early Classic (A.D. 330-600), the power of the sacerdotal élite continued to grow due to the continuing astronomic and calendric discoveries which permitted them to establish with precision when the different agricultural phases would start. This agriculture had long been based on maize. The erection of dated steles began in all the central areas with a double function, both astronomic and religious. The Maya now made human sacrifices only rarely. As a result of the socio-economic complexity, a stratum of nobles came into existence, which at the beginning was very weak. It is thought that these officials belonged, at least in the beginning, to the families of the priests. These nobles, in the localities where the ceremonial centers were near the Nahuatl communities, became functionaries/warriors. Both the lunar-solar calendar and the sacred calendar of maize (Tzolkin), were introduced.

Towards the end of the Fifth Century, it seems that the social stratification was completed. The sacerdotal élites developed peaceful relations with one another. In fact, delegations of priests exchanged visits in order to collaborate more closely.

In agriculture, two crops of maize instead of one were planted every year with perfected methods. The Full Classic Period, A.D. 600-900, was the apogee of the sacerdotal élite and a time when the Mayan civilization came to the acme of its splendor. It seems very probable that a minority of slaves, merchants and artisans existed in this period.

The Maya, like all human beings, could not live without being in society. He depended on the help of others in order to solve the problems of reproduction and survival. But while in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European societies this interdependence took place with a separation between material problems (the necessity of satisfying the needs of the body and of protecting self against the deceits of nature) and spiritual problems (the exigence of knowing and expressing oneself), such a division did not take place within the Mayan culture. In contrast to the division between the material and spiritual which characterized European culture was the Mayan mental attitude: in order to satisfy the needs of the body and to protect himself against the deceits of nature, the Maya felt the exigence of knowing and expressing himself. Thus, taking into consideration the Mayan culture, we must take the problems of survival and religion as a whole.

As stated above, the Mayan society was essential to the life of the man. Within that society, he tried continuously to form families (common life of human beings, the most evident aspect of which is a blood bond); then the families tried to form communities (interest and tradition bond and identical religious concerns).

In order to survive, the Mayan society, and particularly the communities, needed the religious laws which scrupulously followed the traced steps of the myth for every single act. Life was pre-determined; there was a time and place for everything. Common was the property of the earth. Community cohesion, and not the individualism characteristic of European society, was strong.

A fundamental element of the Mayan society was also the identity of origin of consociates according to the anthropogenetic myth and so the possibility of going back to a common history; that is, the identity of tradition and ways of living (customs and language).

Future expectations of the Mayan culture were radically different from the Mediterranean cultures. Whereas the Mediterranean peoples accepted change in many aspects of their culture and actually emphasized the importance of technical progress, the Maya preferred the security and preservation of their culture, guaranteeing agrarian custom and thus human survival. It is on this basis that Europeans have culturo-centrically judged the Mayan society to be static.

In the Mayan society there was an identification of the individual with the rest of his community. On the one hand, we can state that the attitude of the peasant was one of blind obedience to the sacerdotal élite, for this élite was considered to be semi-divine. On the other hand, the priests were in full possession of power and authority and found obedience from the other members of society. Thus we can explain the docile character of the population of the small Maya theocracies of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Classic Period. We can try to analyse this docility by making the distinction between the passive docility or custom affirmed during the preceding periods and preserved as a guarantee of the agricultural practice and that docility which derives from a more rational reflection and the understanding of the need to obey.

We have already seen what this need to obey meant. The peasants, obeying the orders of the priests, knew when to start and complete their agricultural phases — a fact of considerable importance in a latitude where nature withholds her secrets. The planning of the agricultural production, conceived by the priests, gave security to the communities, and in so doing efficiently resolved the problem of survival. The activities of artisans and merchants (if there existed such organized groups) derived security from the stability of this planned agriculture.

The sacerdotal élite needed the nobles because, as in any situation in which power is exercised by one group over another, a hierarchy of faithful, obedient and educated officials is essential for the efficient execution of general orders and concrete commands. The hierarchy of nobles, artisans, peasants and slaves (with an hierarchic subdivision within every strata) was completely under the command of the sacerdotal élite:

1. For religious reasons: that is, because the priests were considered semi-divine and omniscient beings; and it was through them that the deities spoke to the people:[5]

> By nature these two sons were very wise, and great was their wisdom; on earth they were soothsayers of good disposition and good habits. All the arts were taught to Hunbatz and Hunchouén, the sons of Hun-Hunahpu.

2. By custom: that is, for the normative use formed and rooted in the psychology of the subjects of the preceding periods.

3. For material interests: because they possessed the cultural solutions for fundamental problems of survival (calendar, astronomy, prophetic and magic arts).

4. For emotional reasons: that is, due to the need felt on the part of those dependent upon the élite continually to honor it for its discovery of ways to facilitate survival and thus to provide greater security for the communities.

Within the Mayan society, the relations of power were determined by the material and rational interests, felt and made extrinsic as a religious custom.

In treating the consistency of the relation between those who are governed and those who govern, we should not forget the

[5] Adrian Recinos, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concept of legitimacy, the claim of the priests to rule their people on the basis of their hereditary, semi-divine character as bestowed by the deities. Thus, there was no power based solely on material or emotional or religious motives. Every power tries to keep alive the trust of its legitimacy. From this tendency, there arose among the Maya the successful attempt by the priests and nobles to re-connect their past with mythology and to make their semi-divine qualities apparent. Thus, they created deities according to their own image: in *Popol Vuh*[6], after a list of the creating deities, is written: " By nature they were great sages and thinkers." (*E nimac etamanel, e nimac ahnaoh,* in the original).

Sometimes in the pictorial and sculptural representation, it is very difficult to distinguish among deities, mythical beings and priests.

In this mythical episode mentioned below, when Hun-Hunahpu fecundates the virgin Ixquic with his saliva, thus begins the divine descent of the priests and nobles[7]:

> Les paroles dites à Ixquic par les têtes de morts expriment la loi biologique par laquelle les Seigneurs, les sages (prêtres) et les orateurs, c'est-é-dire la caste des nobles, transmettent à leur descendance, avec leurs traits physiques, les traits intellectuels et moraux qui les caractérisent. Comme cette caste est d'origine divine elle reçoit de Dieu lui-même sa sagesse et doit la transmettre à son propre lignage. Cette règle régit encore les institutions sacerdotales chortis de type héréditaire, et c'est la raison de leurs connaissances acquises par révélation divine. Partant de ce point de vue, nous comprendrons mieux le zèle déployé par les théocrates maya-quichés pour conserver intacte la pureté de leur lignage sacerdotal dont la généologie remonte aux *Ahpu*.

The title of " leader ", attributed to the skull of *Ahpu* is implicit in the words *Ah pu,* which is certainly the original root of the Mayan name which indicates the leader or the head, which in English can be synonymous and separate terms. The leader of the macrofamily in Quiché is *apo* and in Yucatec is *Pol, Hol;* and in the non-Maya language of Tarasc is *ehpu*; of Huetar, *ebux*; of Tapahultec, *apé*.

We are unable to determine with scientific exactness the described relations of power between those who were governed and those who governed in Mayan society. It is especially difficult due to the lack of data to determine the intensity of such relations

[6] Adrian Recinos, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

[7] Rafael Girard, *Le Popol Vuh: Historia Culturelle des Maya-Quichés,* Payot, Paris, 1954, p. 91.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the Classic Period. Nevertheless, the second paragraph of this research can be regarded as an indicative hypothesis which fills a void in the study of the Classic Mayan social structure.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

F. Catherwood, *Views of Ancient Monuments in Central America,* New York, 1844.

Azzo Ghidinelli, "La religione nel Centro Cerimoniale Maya di Copan," *Rivista di Etnografia,* Vol. XXII, 1969; "Agricultural Aspects of Mayan Religion," *Anthropological Journal of Canada,* Vol. 8, No. 2, 1970; "I Maya: Una civilia da riscoprire," *Terzo Mondo,* Nos. 7-8, 1970; "L'Economia Maya prima e durante il Periodo Classico," *Terra Ameriga,* No. 22, 1970.

Rafael Girard, *La Misteriosa Cultura Olmeca,* published by the author, Guatemala, CA, 1969.

Fray Diego de Landa, *Relacion de las Cosas de Yucatan,* Madrid, 1881.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Dr Azzo Ghidinelli, was born in Milan in 1940, has had personal contact with the Quecha of Peru, the Nicarao of Nicaragua, and the Chorti of Guatemala. He has engaged in archaeological research work and excavations in the jungles of Costa Rica and on the island of Ometepe (Gran Largo de Nicaragua) and carried out personal research in the archaeological area of Copan (Honduras). In 1969 he became director of NASLA in Milan in close collaboration with *Mani Teso;* and is a member of the Gruppo per le Relazioni Transculturali, Milan, the Associazone Italiana Studi Americanistici, Genoa, and the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association of Montreal. He is a collaborator and member of the editorial staff of the journal *Terzo Mondo* of Milan. Among his publications are: "La Religione nel Centro Cerimoniale Maya di Copan," *Rivista di Etnografia,* Vol. XXII, 1969; "I Maya: Una civilia da riscoprire," *Terzo Mondo, Vol. VII,* 1970; "Agricultural Aspects of Mayan Religion," *Anthropological Journal of Canada,* Vol. VIII, No. 4, 1970; and "L'Economia Maya prima e durante il Periodo Classico," *Terra Ameriga,* Vol. XXII, 1970.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Race, the "Nation of Europe" and Ideology: A Critique

By HERMANN KIESEL

It is not uncommon for a writer dealing honestly with the facts of race and inheritance to find himself severely censured from some quarter or other — usually from the political Left, as the Left has a vigilant eye on its cherished dogmas. Indeed, any such censure from the Right has something of the quality of *rara avis*. Yet it has happened. German-speaking readers of THE MANKIND QUARTERLY[1] may know Hartwig Singer as a political writer, and his review of Jürgen Rieger's little book, *Rasse—ein Problem auch für uns*[2], deserves careful examination.

One may or may not agree with all that Rieger has said in his booklet, but it should in fairness be pointed out that obviously he has done a considerable amount of reading, as can be seen from his bibliographical data. In view of the fact that Rieger's little book is replete with references to, and citations from, the works of R. Ruggles Gates, J. S. B. Haldane, C. D. Darlington, Henry E. Garrett, Ernst Kretschmer, Eugen Fischer, Carleton S. Coon, A. James Gregor, George A. Lundberg, Sir Cyril Burt, Stanley D. Porteus, to mention but a few, one just wonders how he could have managed to arrive at conclusions, as Herr Singer assures us, that "contrast glaringly with the scientific facts." Citing all these authors only to arrive at conclusions contrary to what they said would be, in itself, no small achievement. Actually, however, there is no "first part" of Rieger's book, and no "second part" contrasting with what was said in the first part. Robert Kuttner is cited on page 7, Sir Arthur Keith on page 45, and R. Ruggles Gates on page 56.

One may also be permitted to wonder how Herr Singer[3] would substantiate his charge that Jürgen Rieger "following the empiric I.A.A.E.E. studies, gives only facts about the racial problems between the Black and White major races," and "carries over the conclusions . . . to the relations of the European (White) sub-races (Nordic, Dinaric and so on) to each other." This simply is not true, and as a matter of fact, Rieger does no such thing. On the other hand, we do have evidence such as that furnished by H. N.

[1] THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. XI, No. 1, July-September 1970, pp. 61-63.

[2] Jurgen Rieger, *Rasse — ein Problem auch für uns*, published by the author at 2 Hamburg-Blankenese, Isfeldstr. 7, 1969.

[3] THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arrowsmith[4] to the effect that in fact there are differences of a psychic nature between the various White races (in this case, Nordic and Mediterranean), and one may also refer Herr Singer to Gordon R. Lowe's article "Eye Colour and Personality"[5] in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, which clearly points in the same direction. Hartwig Singer then goes on to say:

> While to begin with, people, state and language are rejected . . . as criteria of racial demarcations, in another place racial boundaries are set up between Germans and Huguenots, Celts, Slavs or Jews, or racial separation is demanded between Germany and the Romance countries. That is, the very criteria which have been shown to be unsuitable are employed.

By the laws of elementary logic, this is a most astonishing statement indeed. Are we to understand that in the reviewer's opinion there are no racial differences whatsoever between Germans, Slavs or Jews? Rieger does not have to "set up" any racial boundaries in Europe because clearly such demarcations are there, and not infrequently roughly conform to language boundaries. Roger Pearson in his *Analysis of Blood Groups as an Aid to the Study of History* has drawn attention to the fact that "In Eastern Europe, blood group surveys confirm linguistic groupings very closely, and the line of 10 per cent frequency of the B gene may be said to divide the Teutonic from the Slav-speaking peoples."

Jürgen Rieger has in fact demanded that the present West German policy of unrestricted immigration and recruitment of manual labour from all over Southern Europe and places as far afield as Turkey or Tunisia be reversed. It is true this demand may collide with the "Europe-a-Nation" concept offered us by Herr Singer under point 3 — just a tiny dose of "national ideology," perhaps? — but it is equally certain that there are quite a few people in Germany who would agree with Rieger on this point. In the Federal Republic of Germany we have at present roughly two million foreign workers, a few hundred thousand of

[4] Professor Dr Gerhard Heberer, Dr Gottfried Kurth, Professor Dr Ilse Schidetzky-Roesing (joint authors and editors), *Anthropologie*, Fischer Bücherei KG, Frankfurt am Main, 1959, p. 290. The authors quote from H. N. Arrowsmith as follows: "Racial differences of physical structure. Proportional shares of positive responses (+ and + +) to the statements 'I spend a considerable portion of my time in public places' and 'I want to live far away from other people,' on the part of members of the Nordic and Mediterranean racial types, respectively." As is clear from the graphs, these responses vary considerably for testees that are classified as "Nordic," "more Nordic than Mediterranean" and "more Mediterranean than Nordic," respectively, and, interestingly, they do even where the cultural environment and the socio-economic level are the same. A few comments to this effect are made on page 291.

[5] Gordon R. Lowe, "Eye Colour and Personality," THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. IX, No. 4, April-June 1969, pp. 178-187.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whom have married German wives and are here to stay. Must we sacrifice our biological identity (or what has remained of it in the course of history) on the shrine of " economic necessities " (so-called), or, for that matter, on the shrine of " Europe-a-Nation "?

The statement that Rieger " demands racial segregation even in Germany, without, however, showing in any concrete way which six states (in conformity with the European sub-races represented in Germany . . .) the country is to be divided into " is, as it stands, grossly misleading. The reader here is made to envisage Germany as being divided into some kind of Bantustans for her inhabitants, which, supposedly, Rieger advocates. This provides the reviewer with an opportunity to label the idea as being " too abstruse (meaning, apparently: too absurd) to allow of serious discussion." What Rieger has in fact advocated on page 51 is a process of cognizance to the effect that racial diversity exists, not only as between the main stocks or species (sometimes called " sub-species," sometimes " races ": the Black, White and so on) of mankind, but between the various White races as well. The immediate aim of this process of cognizance should be, as Rieger puts it, " no further mixing (between the individual White races), the distant objective: realisation of the pure type." One wonders what all this has to do with territorial re-division. In as much as Rieger here outlines a programme for the future one may, of course, agree or disagree with him; but it may be pointed out, against Singer, that

(a) According to the Mendelian Laws (sometimes also referred to as the " De-mixing Laws "), and notwithstanding the " separate transmission of racial characteristics," return crossing is possible within a greater or less number of generations;

(b) Statistically, the less diversity there is between the individual races in a mixed stock, the fewer generations will be required for the " sorting out "; this means that an amalgam of the White races requires less time for realisation of the pure types by return crossing than would, for instance, a Negro-White amalgam, and

(c) Nowhere in his book does Rieger indicate that " a return to unmixed sub-races is basically not possible " — not on page 28 or anywhere else. Nor is return crossing the only way to " realise the pure type," if that is what one has in mind. Here one may point to quite a few instances of one strain or racial type out-breeding another. One would advise the reviewer to take a look at the table " Population of Hawaii, One Century's Development " on page 136 of Professor Siemens' book *Grundzüge der Vererbungslehre, Rassenhygiene und Bevölkerungspolitik* (Munich, 1952). Instead of saying that what Rieger has in mind is " basically not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible" the reviewer therefore should in fairness have pointed out that, technically, it *is* possible — but that he just does not like the idea. Nowhere does Rieger advocate "the replacing of intelligence in the race war," whatever that may mean. What he actually says on page 46 is

> In the race war, intelligence is not necessarily an advantage. In the strife between Black and White a considerable part of the White world seems to become sick by pale cast of thought. When light is thrown on any particular question, the White world is wont to react, sometimes with undecidedness, sometimes with plain do-good stupidity — overlooking the fact that the other side is seeking only its own advantage. The higher a man's intelligence, the less will he usually be prone to commit acts of violence, as witness the crime statistics. This will be of little benefit to him when confronted with violence. Moral rules ("brotherhood," "peacefulness"), while befitting on a tombstone, in this case are of no avail. For Negro leader Malcolm X all Europeans are enemies that are "fair-haired, blue-eyed and white-skinned."

Does Rieger's statement that "intelligence is not necessarily an advantage" warrant the accusation that he is pleading "for the redevelopment of instinctive (and therefore in the White civilisation largely excluded) prejudice"? (The implication here being: at the expense of rational thinking.) Incidentally, a note of involuntary comicality is struck when it is taken for granted that prejudice in our civilisation is "largely excluded." Some people might raise objections. Is prejudice always "instinctive"? Is there any proof that prejudice is an inverse function of intelligence? The reviewer takes up a cudgel on behalf of the I.A.A.E.E., which he feels might be "unjustifiedly disqualified" by guilt of association with Rieger. Has he read I.A.A.E.E. Monograph No. 1, "An Inquiry Concerning Racial Prejudice" by Charles C. Josey, and I.A.A.E.E. Reprint No. 3, "On the Nature of Prejudice" by A. James Gregor? From these it would appear that prejudice under certain circumstances can indeed have a meaningful biological function (which is quite a long way from saying that "Western rationality" should not be "progressively developed").

"His (Rieger's) assertions about the relations between group consciousness (Hofstätter) and race lack the necessary differentiation, as does in general the weighing of the culture factor against the heredity factor." This is strangely reminiscent of what has been described as "the Klineberg twist." It has frequently been pointed out, against the environmentalist view, that cultural frames of reference are not likely to "appear out of the blue," as it were, and Rieger's fundamental thesis on page 41

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is that " race, by the instrument of the group, creates what norms and institutions it may find congenial." What is astonishing indeed is the fact that for this dictum Rieger is accused of a lack of the faculty of discrimination, when it is his reviewer, and not Rieger, who can see no difference, for instance, between the Nordic and the Alpine.

Singer lists a number of " subjects for discussion." This is very well. However, one might perhaps wish to see this list extended by a subject or two. How about, for instance, Dale Adams' article " Philosophy as Science " in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY[6] as one such subject, where it is " stated universally, every successful popular suffrage government of 50 or more years' standing (has been in) a Nordic country." But, alas, this is not a very happy proposition on which to build the " Nation of Europe," so probably that is out.

It will remain the reviewer's secret what today's " German ethnological literature " in general, and Rieger's book in particular, has to do with " the methods of the Nazis." This is on the same level as the charge hurled at Rieger of being a " sectarian." While Rieger may have no claim to orthodoxy it may be argued that some people might find unorthodoxy refreshing, and a number of German publications have " set their critical capacity in a very questionable light " by recommending Rieger's little book to their readers.

Lastly, may one point out to the reviewer that there is no such thing as a " mixed race," which by the definition of race is an oxymoron and therefore should be avoided by anyone writing on this or related topics.

[6] Dale Adams, " Philosophy as Science," THE MANKIND QUARTERLY, Vol. X, No. 3, January-March 1970, pp. 155-165.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

THE YETI

By Odette Tchernine. Neville Speerman, London, 1970. 11 illustrations, 3 maps. pp. 184.

Miss Tchernine has now written a second book on the so-called *Snowman* of the higher mountain systems of Inner Asia. This subject she has studied for many years. In this work she draws together the latest, often unpublished, information mainly from Russian sources, since she first wrote *The Snowman and Company*.

The evidence she puts forward, taken with that which is already known, seems to me to establish the existence of this species, which is that for which Linnaeus allowed in his classification, under the name of *Homo Nocturnus* (Night-time man) or *Homo Troglodytes* (Cave-man). V. A. Khakhlov has proposed *Primihomo asiaticus*, and this seems to us to be the best name. The author appears to regard this *Snowman* as a branch of the Neanderthal species, but the descriptions and locations fit better into the classification of *Primihomo asiaticus*. It is our view, on the evidence given, that it is an early species at a primitive, *Homo erectus*, stage, coming remotely from the same line of development as the Mongoloid stock, or rising parallel with it. Incidentally, we believe that this supports Coon's, and our own, view that speciation occurred very early in the hominoids.

Because of the research which has been done by the Russian scientists, much of which is discussed by Miss Tchernine, there is set out elsewhere in this publication, in a statement of our views of the evolution of the various stocks, an interpretation of the so-called *Snowman*. If the reports received can be relied upon, he is not an ape but a very early primitive form of proto-Mongoloid man. Because of his specialised and inaccessible environment, he has just managed to survive into our times. If there is any case for preserving animal fauna, then there is for seeing to it that the rapidly disappearing *Primihomo asiaticus* is saved from extinction.

The evidence for this stock is most impressive, despite the scepticism and ribbaldry, in a shallow-minded journalistic age, with which it has been greeted. Apart from all other reports, that of the Russian Commissar General, Mikhail Stepanovitch Topil'skiy, is extremely convincing. The author tells us (p. 104):—

> In 1925 the general was a Commissar with troops that had been sent in pursuit of a band of White Army forces retreating through the Pamirs. In the high region of the Vanchsk area they heard tales of wild men from the local people. . . . In the Vanchsk and Yazgulemsk Ranges the troops found bare footprints in the snow, and ending at the foot of a cliff-face too steep to be climbed by man . . . during a battle between the Reds and the Whites, a wounded Red soldier, an Uzbek, reported that as they were firing into a cave, in which Whites were thought to be, a wild hairy man came running out, making inarticulate noises, into the machine-gun fire, and was killed.
>
> "At first," said the general, "I thought it was the corpse of an ape . . . but I knew there were no apes in the Pamirs, and, moreover, the body looked far more human than ape-like, indeed, fully human."
>
> . . . their medical officer established it was definitely *not* a man. Then they turned the corpse over and measured it. It was male and 165/170 cms. long. [5 feet 4½ inches to 5 feet 6¼ inches.] It had grey hair here and there, so it seemed fairly old, but the hair was greyish-brown. On the breast and upper part of the body, the hair was more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brown, and more grey on the belly. The area with least hair was the buttocks, from which the medical officer concluded it sat like a man. . . .

The dead creature lay with eyes open and teeth bared. The eyes were dark, teeth very big and even but no different from human teeth in shape. The brow sloped, and the brows above the eyes were heavy, with extremely salient cheek-bones, like a Mongolian.

There is much more pointing to similarities and differences. But the point here is that this medical officer and his general were able to examine a *Snowman* they had just inadvertently killed. They pronounced that it was not an ape, and they found numerous features similar to those of the modern species of men. There seems to be little doubt that they were describing a primitive type of man, whose appearance is similar to that of the ancestors of at least one human stock — and I believe that is the Mongoloid.

The authoress gives accounts of actual *Almas* (as they are called north of the Eurasiatic mountain spine) who have come in contact with *Homo sapiens*. In some cases they have been domesticated and have been able to perform simple tasks. There are individuals, actually named, who are said to be derived from interbreeding with them in recent times. The account of them is widespread throughout eastern Russia and far into Asia. Hunting of them, to provide elements for the pharmacopeia of the Manchurian and other Mongoloid peoples, was common until relatively recently, when their numbers have been greatly depleted.

This book is worthy of careful study. There is an overwhelming case for a thorough investigation, and an end to the deliberately imposed silence which appears to have become the current policy in Russia – where most of the evidence is to be found.

R. GAYRE OF GAYRE

THE MAGIC WORLD OF THE XHOSA

By Aubrey Elliott 2nd edition, Collins, Glasgow, London, and Johannesburg, 1971. Numerous illustrations, many in colour. Pp. 144. Price £3.50.

Mr Elliot has two advantages, first in having been brought up with the Xhosa people, and secondly in being a foremost photographer — as a consequence of which skill the illustrations are superb.

The purpose of this book is to record the life of those Xhosas who remain rural, and who have not been acculturated to the urbanised civilization of white South Africa, or the developing business and industrial areas of the Transkei. All this Mr Elliot has done most effectively.

As the author points out the Xhosa was the first Bantu nation with which the Europeans came into contact. They were never conquered, as far as we know, by any other Bantu — not even by Shaka, the King of the Zulus.

For those who appear to suggest that White peoples should "integrate" with others it cannot be too frequently pointed out that loyalty to the much derided "Kith and Kin" is inherent in all peoples. The following quotation (p. 13) from Mr Elliott is apposite—

> Men of any particular tribe are always proud of their respective nationalities and rate loyalty to their chief and to their clans among the first essentials in their code of honour.

Mr Elliott rightly draws attention to the large amount of Hottentot blood absorbed by some clans of the Xhosas (p. 17). The peppercorn type of hair so frequently found among them is evidence of this.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This crossing with the Hottentot is believed to have been intellectually beneficial to the Xhosa as the Hottentots are said to have been more intelligent (p. 23).

The Damaqua Hottentots were absorbed by the Xhosas. The Gqunukwebe clan of the Xhosa is also a mixture of the Xhosa and the Gonaqua Hottentots (p. 23).

This is a full account, written in non-technical language, of the Xhosa, and one which must be in the library of anyone interested in the nationalities of Southern Africa. The pictures alone are a valuable record of the racial type — much better than can be found elsewhere.

THE NEGRO IMPACT ON WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Edited by Joseph S. Roucek and Thomas Kiernan. Vision Press Ltd., London, 1970. Pp. 506. Price £4.20.

No book could better illustrate the hallmark of the latter half of the twentieth century than this, which is made up of a series of articles. Once one departs from the exact, physical and biological sciences, and enters the realm of sociology and social anthropology, one leaves science, exactness and truth behind. Everything is twisted, bent and distorted to serve one end — in this case the laudation of the Negro. To achieve this in the intellectual fields of precise scientific objectivity, evaluation and truth are the first casualties. What does that matter in our times when truth is of no consequence, only the achievement of an end, the justification of a doctrine so unjustified by facts that in any other age it would not have been able to find its way into print.

This book is damned by including such an essay as that of Ronald W. Davis — the *Negro Contributions to Exploration of The Globe* (pp. 33) setting out to show that Vasco da Gama was able to reach India through an "East African pilot," Ibn Madjid. The author states that the pilot was of uncertain ethnic origins, which is not the case. Arabs were settled all down the East African coast where they had cities, with numerous palaces, Mosques, and communities ruled over by sultans. Having, without any justification stated that Ibn Madjid was of uncertain racial origin — it goes on to call him a long-term resident of East Africa. From this he becomes an African — this Moslem Arab and inventor of a sailing pilot of the Indian Ocean. This is as patently dishonest as to call the White or Black Americans as of uncertain ethnic origin and, as Americans, to infer they are Amerindians or Red Indians.

On page 34 this savant of distortion and suppression of the truth goes on to equate the Moors with Africans and, by implication, Negroes. "Many Africans and persons of the Ibero-Moroccan community thus accompanied the early Spanish expeditions." But this is irrelevant to the Negro problem. "African" is not necessarily Negro. The Horn of Africa, the Sudan, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, South Africa, Rhodesia, Angola, and Mozambique, are dominated by peoples who are not Negroes, and who are as much African as are the Negroes.

The prize falsity is the statement that "Moors and Negroes, largely owing to their skills and reservoir of learning, could pass freely to the New World, whereas Jews could not." (page 34.) Need one read any further? Moors certainly had learning, as had the Jews; the Negroes had none. But here everything is turned upside down and the learned Negro is acceptable while the ignorant Jew is not. All the way through African is used to infer Negro descent, playing on the ignorance of the average reader who thinks of the Negro as an African.

By page 38 this outstanding propagandist is talking of Pharaonic Egypt and trading expeditions from Egypt to the land of Punt. All this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is retailed in a chapter on Negro contributions to the Exploration of the Globe (*sic*), as though it had something to do with the Negro. The writer goes on to retail the great expeditions of the Egyptians into inner Africa, as though these were those of the Negro people, carefully suppressing the fact that they were the expansion of the White Egyptian civilisation into Darkest Negro Africa, which remained dark from then till Livingstone also plunged into the interior. By page 39 we are back to the East African coast and navigation on the Indian Ocean — all of which is true — except that it had nothing to do with Negroes, but Arabs, some of whom were from the East African Arab settlements. Then follow pages of African exploration and trade, interesting in themselves which, if the writer had been honest, would have made clear that they were the result of Arabs, Berber, and similar Caucasoid, endeavour. But all this is under a chapter heading of a *Negro* contribution.

The paper by Lewis H. Carlson, *The Negro in Science,* is a much more honest contribution.

James D. Tyms in *African Contributions to World Religion* refers to Egypt and Ethiopia as having made their contributions to literate religion. They are African peoples, but not Negroid, and in the context of this book it is wholly wrong not to point out that fact. Having said that it is only fair to add that this essay is a useful exposition of Negro religion and exposition of the concept of the Great God among the peoples of this stock. As such it goes some way to redeem the book.

Jack J. Cardoso in *The Black Man as a Soldier* probably presses his case too far. For the American Negro, who is his principal subject, was not derived from any particularly noted military origin. To compare him with the Zulus, by citing them as Negro warriors, is to misunderstand the types. The Zulus belong to a strain quite different from these conquered West Africans who became the slaves of America.

We are back to complete distortion of fact when we come to *The Moorish Impact on Western Europe* by Philip S. Cohen and Francesco Corkasco. What on earth has the Caucasoid Moor to do with Negroes?

TRAITORS' END: THE RISE AND FALL OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

By Nathaniel Weyl. Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York. Pp. 261. Price $6.95.

Mr Nathaniel Weyl needs no introduction, especially in the field of communism of which he knows about as much as any living person. Since this book deals with Southern Africa, whose political forces have become involved with racial affairs, it is clear that an understanding of both is essential before any interpretation can be given of that part of Africa.

He discusses the position between 1950 and 1960 when the communist movement, allied to a number of "fronts", such as the African National Congress and associated with various so-called "liberal" groups, attempted to organise the Bantu, the Indians, and Cape Coloureds against the government. In this it had the open support of the Afro-Asian bloc (as it still has), the Soviet Union, as might be expected, and, in addition, the Kennedy Administration. (It might be pointed out today that the Churches might be thrown in for good measure — proceeding on a parallel course with communism.) Despite the severity of the pressures exerted against South Africa and the Portuguese and Rhodesian territories, they are steadily forging ahead.

The author, with his usual deft perception, argues that the American attitude should be dictated by national interests. Mr Weyl draws attention

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the fact that Abram Fischer was a chief defending counsel at the Rivonia Trials. It might also be added that he was counsel for the *Sunday Times* of South Africa when I sued that paper for defamation at the time when I was guest of honour of the Southern African Genetics Congress. Since the gravaman of the defamation was that I was a "fascist geneticist" it is significant that this paper should have turned to an under-cover communist to defend it — unsuccessfully as things turned out. There is no doubt that the whole drive against the classical interpretations of ethnology is communist inspired, and those which inject into serious debate on racial problems allegations of racist, nazi, and fascist, are usually in some way associated with communism or one of its many fronts.

The author's account of the Rivonia trials and Fischer are well-written and full of interest. His outline of how communism has made an ally of the Christian Churches under the leadership of the Anglican are worth pondering — and are an insight into the mammoth campaign which the churches have developed in recent years in this direction.

This book should be read by all who wish to understand the hidden forces which today are exploiting the race problem to their own interests.

R. GAYRE OF GAYRE

RELIGION AND THE RACIAL CONTROVERSY: THE FALSE PROPAGANDA OF THE CHURCH

By H. B. Isherwood, Racial Preservation Society, 14 Kingsley Road, Brighton, Sussex, England. Pp. 16. Price 17½p: 25 cents.

Believing that the cause of Christian oecumenism could be served thereby, the Church hierarchy are taking an increasingly active part in politics associated with social problems inevitably arising when fundamentally different races confront each other in the struggle for survival in a world of diminishing dimensions.

For its purpose the Church asserts it has a special mission to interpret and assess the social, including racial and political, aspects of human nature on moral principles which it claims are derived from the Scriptures.

Be that as it may, the Church may be falling into error when it rejects, discounts, or ignores the significance of the inherent biological racial differentiation which characterizes humanity and which predisposes human beings one way or another in their instinctive attitude to things supernatural.

The kind of criticism the Church must now expect to face as a result of its incursion into secular racial politics is admirably summarized in the paper under review.

PRIMITIVE MARRIAGE: AN INQUIRY INTO THE ORIGIN OF THE FORM OF CAPTIVE IN MARRIAGE CEREMONIES

By John F. McLennan, edited and with an introduction by Peter Rivière. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1970. Pp. 152. Price £3.80.

This is a reprint of one of the classics of social anthropology. John Ferguson McLennan (1827-81), one of the founders of this branch of anthropology, held that the type of marriage was analogous to the development which society had achieved at any given time. He also believed that man had progressed during his evolution of society from a promiscuous state to polyandry and polygamy, to, in the end, monogamy.

One of the interesting points about this reprint is that Dr P. G. Rivière, who was trained at both Oxford and Cambridge, and who has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been a visiting professor to Harvard University, has written an extensive introduction which adds greatly to the original text. He gives an account of McLennan's origin and history, starting with his birth on 14th October 1827 in the capital of the Highlands of Scotland, Inverness. He graduated at Aberdeen University, and later went to Cambridge but did not trouble to take his degree. He returned to Edinburgh to become a law student, living a hundred yards or so from where this publication is edited, at 25 India Street, and was called to the bar in 1857. In the same year his article on law was published in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Later he moved to London. All his hopes of a professorate at Cambridge, and also at Cornell, were to remain unfulfilled — which goes to show how in the light of history it was not McLennan that was found wanting but those who failed to appreciate his merit.

McLennan had a broad outlook and could write on many subjects, varying from law to biography, to Scottish art and artists, and to social anthropology. This is essentially a Scottish characteristic, where the narrow specialist in the English and American sense is neither encouraged by the Scottish education system nor by Scottish genius.

Basically the concept of McLennan was that civilized man arose along a line in which matriliny preceded the patriarchal society, with polyandry on the way one from the other. His views have not been accepted by those who have followed him. He was, however, one of the first to apply scientific and evolutionary method to social anthropology, as distinct from the environmentalist which accounted for social change in response to environment. As such he is one of the true founders of scientific social anthropology.

MULTIVARIATE PROCEDURES FOR THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

By W. W. Cooley and P. R. Lohnes. John Wiley, New York, 1962. Pp. 211. Price $8.95.

This volume is an excellent handbook for research workers interested in applying multivariate techniques to investigate problems in the behavioral sciences. The introductory two chapters contain a brief survey of matrix algebra, the subject matter of multivariate analysis, the principles of FORTRAN programming, and the calculation of the basic correlation and variance-covariance (dispersion) matrices. Then follow chapters on Multiple and Canonical Correlation, Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Covariance, Analysis of Variance and Covariance for Two- and Three-Way Designs, Multiple-Discriminant Analysis, Classification Procedures, and Factor Analysis. The volume closes with a chapter on utility subroutines — i.e., matrix inversion, and the calculation of eigen values and eigen vectors by a variety of methods.

Each of the chapters on the different procedures of multivariate analysis contains a brief outline of the mathematics of that particular technique, a description of the relevant statistical tests, examples of the technique, and flowcharts and FORTRAN programs of the procedure. The examples are all taken from the field of psychology. The FORTRAN programs were written for and tested on the IBM 709. All in all, the book contains some eleven programs for various multivariate procedures and six programs for useful mathematical subroutines (i.e., calculation of correlation matrices, eigen values, eigen vectors, *et al*). The reader who has some background in matrix algebra and FORTRAN programming will find this book the clearest introduction to the subject matter of multivariate analysis and the most useful handbook for research workers in this field.

DONALD A. SWAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MEDITERRANEAN RACE IN ASIA BEFORE THE IRON AGE

By Mario Cappieri, edited by Henry Field. Field Research Projects, Coconut Grove, Miami, Florida 33133. Occasional Paper No. 8, 1969. 9 tables. Pp. 28.

Professor Cappieri, our distinguished colleague and co-editor, has made an interesting contribution to the subject of the extension of the Mediterranean race. In it he shows that while the Mediterranean race may be divided into several ethnic groups, such as Troad, Anatolian, Syro-Palestinian, Mesopotamian, Iranian, Turkmenian, and Indian, there was a general extension from the Mediterranean throughout western Asia into India of the one stock.

He takes the view that the brachycephalisation which occurs in this population was not due to the infiltration of Armenoid and Alpine types. This view might not command the support of most workers in this field. Concerning, however, his general thesis Professor Cappieri has made an extremely worthwhile contribution, in showing that the whole area from the Mediterranean to India was formerly inhabited before the Iron Age by one great racial stock. This has a considerable bearing, for instance, on the modern Indian population. It was always the view of Professor R. Ruggles Gates, as it is still of this reviewer, that the Indian caste population was more Mediterranean than anything else, and that the darker skin than that found in the Western Mediterranean was due more to a mutation (which was a protection in the tropical climatic regions in which the Indians live) than it was due to miscegenation with the aboriginal (mainly Australoid) population of India.

The tables and graphs are good evidence for the main thesis of Professor Cappieri.

R. GAYRE OF GAYRE.

THE SICILIAN COLONY DATES: STUDIES IN CHRONOGRAPHY I

By Molly Broadbent Miller. Published by State University of New York Press, Albany, 1970. Pp. 287. Price $15.00.

Dr Molly Miller, a BA of Manchester in Classics, followed by a PhD from Glasgow University in 1953, has occupied a lecturing post at the latter university and has been visiting Professor of Classics to the State University of New York. She has written on Greek genealogy and altogether is well-qualified to speak with authority in this field.

Dr Miller discusses how Greek historians were able to arrive at exact dates for events which they did not witness, and how it was that differing dates were arrived at by different writers. This she does ably and clearly. She poses the problem by reference to evidence from complete texts, brings forward evidence from primary sources, ties together the events of the Greek mainland and its colonies, and ends with the organisation of the international trade between 760 and 860 BC.

Dr Miller points out that Greek historiography was able to adjust dates for earlier periods and these were summed up in the *Chronicle of Eùsibius*. In this book, to help to solve this problem, the dates of the Sicilian colony are taken since they are given by both Thucydicles and Eùsebius, from the 8th to 6th centuries BC, and the attempt is made to explain how the different dates were arrived at.

The section dealing with demography and historical time (pp. 135ff) is not merely interesting but highly important. Here statistical methods are employed. The writer does not restrict herself to Greek and Sicilian history but draws upon Babylonian and other sources further afield. The result is that we get some conception of what constituted a genera-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion among the several cultures of the ancient world. What constituted a generation was not the same in all.

This is a profound study of great value to the historian and all those interested in the peoples of the ancient world of the Mediterranean and surrounding cultures.

NAKED APE OR HOMO SAPIENS?: A REPLY TO DESMOND MORRIS

By John Lewis and Bernard Towers. Garnstone Press, London, 1969. Pp. 134. Price £1.05.

The publishers say that "this is a powerful reply, on scientific and philosophical grounds, to Desmond Morris's *The Naked Ape*. The authors are Dr John Lewis, who studied anthropology at Cambridge, and Dr Bernard Towers, whose work is in the field of anatomy, and who is a fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and University Lecturer in Anatomy.

They find they are at considerable variance with Desmond Morris, especially in such matters as the uniqueness of man, his aggression, his ethical attitudes and control of his environment.

We are, however, critical of the totality of their approach, and the more so as they propound the quite unprovable concept that "man is entirely a product of culture, imparted by teaching and learning. Comparing the character of men living in ancient Egypt or under the medieval monarchies with the same races today, Dobzhansky sees a total transformation, and declares that most of 'these changes evidently occurred not because human populations were altered genetically, but because they were altered culturally'". (p. 104.)

This view can be, in our opinion, successfully challenged. The Nazis reverted to a barbarism which their ancestors practised against the Slavs, although they were now people living within the ambient of western Christian civilisation. When the same or similar situations arise it is more likely that the response will follow the lines of inherent reaction rather than those due to culture. Man is not a creature of his environment, whether it is geographical or sociological. Man's nature dominates and transforms these according to his heredity or genetic ability. Physical and social environments have their place, it is true, but they are not the most important factors.

JAPAN'S OUTCASTES: THE PROBLEM OF THE BURAKUMIN

By George A. Devos. Minority Rights Group, 36 Craven Street, London WC2. Report No. 3, 17 pp. Price 30p.

This monograph draws attention to the minority position of an outcast group called the Buraku or Eta in Japan, who in the past were serfs. The Japanese consider them of non-Japanese origin, and look to Koreans as the racial group from which they are derived. The authors deny this and state that blood grouping shows that they are identical with the Japanese.

Without more information one cannot accept the claim that blood groups can settle this problem, unless they have been analysed in their various series. Thus, to cite an example. The White and Negroid races are high in A and O in the ABO blood group series, whereas the Mongoloids are high in B and O. It is obvious, under such circumstances that the ABO blood groups, of themselves, cannot distinguish a White-Yellow from a Black-Yellow cross without further refinements of serological techniques. Of more importance than blood group analyses it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be better to have a description of physical traits. If these show differences, whatever blood group analyses may imply, then the two stocks are different.

The authors seek to draw parallels with the American Negro, and suggest that the lower IQ scores of the Buraku, as in the case of the Negroes, is environmentally conditioned in a hostile milieu created by the dominant stock. They use the emotive word "racialists" for those who argue that these differences are inherent. Having branded themselves propagandists in this manner, it is hardly likely that their arguments can be taken as objective.

The Negroid peoples in Africa were not, in all their long evolution, arising in a hostile cultural environment produced by White or other stocks — yet their civilisation when discovered by other races was at a very low and primitive level, as it still remains. Consequently, there is an *a priori* basis for assuming that there is an inherent genetic difference. The IQ scores of American Negroes are consistent with this. Furthermore, other stocks who entered America in an unprivileged position, such as the Jews, Irish, and Italians, against whom there still tends to be social and economic barriers, have, despite all this, risen and left behind the lowly level enjoyed by the American Negro.

Therefore, since the author relies upon such shoddy reasoning for his analogy to explain the Buraka, it does not give one much confidence in accepting his reasoning, when he tries to argue that their backward situation is environmental and not genetic. To say, therefore, that the "poor showing in intelligence tests is due to forms of social debilitation rather than to any biological differentiation in groups" (p. 10) is an *obiter dicta* which is unlikely to be proved correct in any objective study of the problem.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reprints of interest to the Genealogist

S. R. Publishers here offer some titles from their range of reprints which will appeal to those with an interest in the field of genealogy. These are beautifully prepared facsimile reprints of rare works, for long out of print and virtually unobtainable.

History, Directory and Gazetteer of the County of York

by Edward Baines

Published: Leeds Mercury, 1822-1823. Reprinted with new introductory notes by Owen Ashmore. A directory, listing population, professions and notable inhabitants of the various towns, cities and villages in Yorkshire.

pp. 654 + cxliv and 656. 2 volumes — £3.15 per volume

John Speed's Atlas of Wales

(Part II of ' The Theatre of Great Britaine ')

Published: London, 1676. This is an exact facsimile of the 1676 edition. Probably the greatest British cartographer ever, Speed's work is still available in many formats but this will be the first time that his complete Atlas of Wales has been available again for over 250 years.

pp. 64 — £5.25

Birmingham Inventors and Inventions

by R. B. Prosser

Published: Birmingham, 1881, Journal Printing Works. Originally published in an edition of only 50 copies, this is probably the rarest book on Birmingham. The new work includes an introduction by Professor Asa Briggs, Vice-Chancellor of Sussex University.

pp. 264. — £2.50

Place Names of Scotland

by Rev. J. B. Johnston

A reprint from the 1934 edition. Probably the most important work of this well-known philologist.

pp. 352. — £3.50

Full lists and details available from:

S. R. Publishers Limited

East Ardsley, Wakefield, Yorkshire

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOUVELLE ECOLE

REVUE DE RECHERCHE ET D'ETUDES SUR LA CIVILISATION EUROPEENNE

Parmi les textes publiés récemment: *L'écriture runique* (Alain de Benoist); *Le problème de l'avortment* (Jean-Claude Valla); *Les greffes d'organes* (Roger Vétillard); *Le sanctuaire de Stonehenge* (Jean-Jacques Mourreau); *Psychologie raciale et intégration scolaire* (Alain de Benoist); *La condition féminine au Moyen-Age et dans l'Antiquité* (Jean-Claude Bardet); *Empirisme logique et "Wiener Kreis"* (Louis Rougier); *L'écriture chinoise* (Guy Brossolet); *Bertrand Russell et les mathématiques* (Robert Blanché); *Le nouveau calendrier liturgique* (Alain de Benoist); etc.

NOUVELLE ECOLE

B.P. 129-07/75 — PARIS 7 (FRANCE)

Le numéro: 7 FF; *L'abonnement annuel* (six numéros): 40 FF

Spécimen gratuit sur demande.

ZAMBEZIA

JOURNAL OF THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF RHODESIA

Contents of Vol. 1, No. 2 *include*

Arthur Shearly Cripps: an Assessment, by D. E. Borrell; The Changing Rhodesian Political Culture, 1969, by P. B. Harris; The Cercmony of Mishashe (Green Vegetables) held in Mashonaland, by M. Gelfand; A Village School and Community Development in a Rhodesian Tribal Trust Land, by M. W. Murphree; Afrikaner and Shona Settlement in the Enkeldoorn Area, 1890-1900, by D. N. Beach; Selected Aspects of the Socio-Economic Character of Natal Towns, by M. A. H. Smout; The Role of Environmental Factors in the Education of African Pupils, by S. F. W. Orbell; Tribalism and Detribalization in Southern and Central Africa, by D. H. Reader.

Annual subscription: Rhod. $1.00

THE LIBRARIAN (Exchanges and Publications)
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF RHODESIA
P.O. Box MP45, MOUNT PLEASANT, RHODESIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ethnological Elements of Africa

By R. GAYRE OF GAYRE

This collection of essays on African ethnology originally appeared as a series of articles published during the last few years in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY. They have now been revised where necessary and brought together in this book which does not set out to deal in detail with every aspect of this vast subject but attempts to synthesise the major racial elements of Africa, to indicate their relationships and differences, and to formulate a theory of the racial origins of the African populations of our times.

170 pages *15 plates*

£1.40 $5.00

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

1 DARNAWAY STREET, EDINBURGH. EH3 6DW
SCOTLAND

Population Review

A JOURNAL OF ASIAN DEMOGRAPHY

Editor: S. CHANDRASEKHAR

The contents of the TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY ISSUE *include:*

The Crowded World by Sir Julian Huxley; Population Growth in the United States by Professor Philip M. Hauser; The Causes of Poverty: a Clinical View by Dr John Kenneth Galbraith; Population and Freedom by Professor Joseph J. Spengler; The Indians of British Guiana by Dr G. C. L. Bertram; Population Problems in a Developing Economy by Professor S. Chandrasekhar; The Ethnic Groups of Malaya: a Population Study by Dr Mukul K. Dey.

Published by

INDIAN INSTITUTE FOR POPULATION STUDIES
GANDHINAGAR, MADRAS-20, INDIA

Price Rs 5. *Annual Subscription* Rs 10 . £1 . $4.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VERITAS BOOKSHOP

for conservative books on

RACE DIFFERENCES

SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT

SOUTH AFRICA and AFRICA

Write for book lists to

P.O. Box 2052, Pretoria, South Africa

The Rhodesian crisis is YOUR crisis!

Lenin said: "First we will take eastern Europe. Next the masses of Asia. Then we shall encircle that last bastion of capitalism, the United States. We shall not have to attack. It will fall into our hands like an overripe fruit."

Rhodesia is fighting YOUR battle NOW!

If she goes under YOU ARE NEXT!

Read RHODESIA AND WORLD REPORT

Published monthly. Annual subscription: surface mail £1.13 ($3.50); air mail £2.25 ($10.50).

P.O. Box 1871, Salisbury, Rhodesia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GENUS

The official publication of the

ITALIAN COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF POPULATION PROBLEMS

Published under the auspices of
the National Research Council
Editor: NORA FEDERICI

The Scientific Committee of *Genus* is composed of the members of the Technical Committee of the Italian Committee for the Study of Population Problems: V. Castellano, University of Rome; P. Fortunati, University of Bologna; G. Genna, University of Rome; G. L'Eltore, University of Rome; G. A. Maccacaro, University of Milan; I. Scardovi, University of Bologna; and Nora Federici (President).

Volume XXV, 1969, includes: A Monte Carlo Simulation of Human Reproduction, by J. C. Barrett; Gainful Occupation and Motherhood—The Position of Women in Hungary, by E. Szabady; Nuzialità, natalità e cicli brevi dell'economia—l'esperienza italiana tra il 1863 e il 1965, by A. Santini; Recenti variazioni dei modelli di nuzialità in Italia, by P. de Sandre; Preliminary Description of the External Morphology of What Appeared to be the Fresh Corpse of a Hitherto Unknown Form of Living Hominid, by I. T. Sanderson.

The annual subscription to *Genus* is $10.00 (or equivalent), and subscriptions should be sent to: Segreteria del Comitato Italiano per lo Studio dei Problemi della Popolazione, Via Ombrone 8, Rome 00198, Italy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MANKIND QUARTERLY

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Single issue—40p ($1.50); annual subscription (4 issues)—£1.50 ($5.00); three year subscription (12 issues) —£4 ($14.00). Post free by surface mail. Copies will be sent by air mail on payment of an extra £1.50 ($5.00) per year or 40p ($1.25) per copy. Back numbers are supplied while available at 50p ($1.75) each. No responsibility can be accepted for copies lost in the post after dispatch.

CONTRIBUTIONS

All material submitted for publication in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY must be fully and finally corrected, and must be in clear, double-spaced typing, preferably in triplicate. A short biographical note and a suitable photograph of the author may be sent with the article for inclusion if space permits.

The Editors do not accept responsibility for the views expressed by individual contributors.

PAYMENT TO AUTHORS

Authors of articles published in THE MANKIND QUARTERLY are now paid at the rate of one guinea or $2.50 per printed page, and they also receive twelve free copies of the issue concerned. This applies to articles received after the 1st of January 1967.

1 DARNAWAY STREET, EDINBURGH. EH3 6DW
SCOTLAND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED